



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No.

Y1:1-57-N3

H8-1

Ac. No.

102063

Date of release for loan

24 OCT 1957

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below.

An overdue charge of one anna will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

1720 - 1865

THE *Scandinavian* *Countries*, 1720-1865

THE RISE OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES

VOLUME I

BY B. J. HOVDE

Cornell University Press

ITHACA, NEW YORK, 1948

Copyright 1943 by Chapman & Grimes

Copyright assigned 1948 to Cornell University Press

Reissued 1948

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON· GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Printed in the United States of America

*In Memory of
My Father and My Mother*

PREFACE

Archibald Carey Coolidge, in the second volume of the *American Historical Review*, made "A Plea for the study of the History of Northern Europe," and it was he who founded the excellent Scandinavian collection in the Harvard College Library. Comparatively few American scholars responded, however, and as late as 1932 the Committee of the American Historical Association on the Planning of Research pointed to Scandinavian history as a neglected field. The book here submitted to the public is the result of eight years' study in an effort to sketch the outlines of Scandinavian history since 1720 and to present a guide for the more specialized work without which a satisfactory understanding of these peoples will remain impossible.

In spite of the inadequacy of historical literature on this subject, the Scandinavian countries are today the cynosures of believers in democratic procedures. There more truly than anywhere else, it is often maintained, evidence may be found that when honestly and sincerely applied the democratic way of life is capable of solving the most acute problems of modern society. Enthusiastic visitors return to the United States every year with fulsome praise for the neatness and orderliness of Scandinavian institutions and for the practical sense with which these countries attack the perplexing issues of our time. They are pointed to as proof that neither Communist nor Fascist extremes are necessary. But when these admirers are asked why the Scandinavian countries seem to be more successful than others in making democracy work the answers usually refer to some mysterious virtue denied to other nations. The historian will never accept so specious an explanation. He will seek tangible facts, discoverable only in history. I hope that the present volume will contribute toward an understanding of the real Scandinavian, a human being with his full share of vices as well as virtues, who has been an equal participant in the development of modern civilization, subject to a somewhat peculiar material environment, and blessed with a long period of peace.

In justice to the subject this work has been planned in two parts, the first to cover the period from 1720 to 1865 and the second to carry Scandinavian history down to the present. The selection of the dates bracketing the first part has been somewhat arbitrary, but not without purpose. In 1720 the Scandinavian countries were but beginning to develop a modern commerce and were still conducting agriculture upon the essentially medieval communal pattern; by 1865 urban economic enterprise, commercial, financial and industrial, was well launched on the course of modern technique, and agriculture was responding to the same impulses that had transformed the towns. In 1720 new cultural forces began to assert themselves in religion, philosophy, literature and the arts, which had by 1865 so far secularized Scandinavian culture that the old was forever gone. In 1720 political life was essentially monarchical and aristocratic; by 1865 it was preponderantly democratic. And throughout the whole period, especially during the decades of most rapid economic change after 1830 new social problems presented themselves and the daily life of the average citizen was altered to conform with the new era. It may thus be safely asserted that between 1720 and 1865 the Scandinavian countries passed from the pre-capitalistic to the capitalistic stage of civilization.

It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge the encouragement and assistance I have enjoyed in writing this book. Professor Knut Gjerset, whose *History of the Norwegian People* still ranks as the best history of any Scandinavian country in English, gave me as a student at Luther College a never-ending interest in the Scandinavian peoples, and was until his recent death a constant source of inspiration. Professor Gilbert Giddings Benjamin, now at the University of Southern California, has for many years been a close friend and adviser. From Professor Arthur Meier Schlesinger of Harvard I have had the advantage of guidance and fellowship, both as a graduate student at the University of Iowa and during a summer in Cambridge. To Professor Halvdan Koht at the University of Oslo, now foreign minister of Norway, to Professor Sverre Steen at the same university, Dr. Hans Jensen of Copenhagen, Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes and Dr. Ralph E. Turner I owe

much of the viewpoint from which this book has been written. The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation generously subsidized a year of study abroad and the American Scandinavian Foundation one subsequent summer. In common with countless others I acknowledge a debt of gratitude to many libraries and their staffs, particularly the Widener Library at Cambridge, Massachusetts, the University of Minnesota Library, the Congressional Library at Washington, D.C., the Luther College Library, the University Library in Oslo, the Royal and University Libraries in Copenhagen, and the Royal Library in Stockholm. Dr. John Carroll Amundson and Mrs. Maxine Amundson have spent many laborious hours correcting the manuscript for style and have earned my enduring appreciation for their many constructive suggestions. To all these my friends I owe much of what value this work may have; its faults, which are many, are my own.

Theresse A. Hovde has had far more than a wife's share in our book. Every paragraph, every word has had her closest attention. I am particularly thankful for her accurate translation of several poems.

B. J. H.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

POST SCRIPT

The above was written before Hitler attacked Poland to precipitate the present war. But what is herein described is sturdy history. Let the record stand. The monuments of peaceful achievement are more important than the incidents of warfare.

B. J. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

I. INDUSTRY AND TRADE: THE PERIOD OF PREDOMINANT MERCANTILISM, 1720-1830	15
I. Economic Theory	16
II. Industry	21
III. Commerce and Shipping, 1720-1756	35
IV. The Rewards of Neutrality, 1756-1807	41
V. Banks and Currencies to 1814	47
VI. Collapse and Recovery, 1814-1830	50
II. AGRICULTURE: THE DECLINE OF THE OLD SYSTEM	59
I. The Old System	59
II. The Old System Challenged	72
III. Practical Steps Toward the Capitalistic Agricultural System	80
III. THE FOUNDING OF A MIDDLE CLASS CULTURE	89
I. The European Background	89
II. Pietism	93
III. Pioneers of the New Thought	103
IV. THE AGE OF REASON	119
I. The Sciences	119
II. Rationalism at its Height	129
III. Emergent Romanticism	139
V. THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE ARTS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	150
VI. THE SOCIAL STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL POWER:	
THE OLD REGIME, 1720-1814	177
I. Political Struggles in Sweden until 1789	180
II. Social Politics under Dano-Norwegian Absolutism until 1789	194
III. Scandinavia and the French Revolution	207
VII. THE TRIUMPH OF ECONOMIC LIBERALISM, 1814-1865	229
I. Adoption of Liberal Economic Principles	229

II. Banking and the Flow of Capital	241
III. The Industrial Revolution	249
IV. Communications	261
V. Trade, Domestic and Foreign	269
VIII. AGRICULTURE: THE NEW SYSTEM	276
I. Individualization of the Land	276
II. Removal of Special Burdens	282
III. The New Rural Social System	286
IV. Better Agricultural Techniques	290
IX. THE RELIGION OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES	303
I. Elements of Mysticism in the Age of Reason	304
II. The Popular Religious Revival	307
III. The Upper Class Religious Revival	328
IV. Democratization of the Institutional Church	343
X. SCANDINAVIAN PHILOSOPHY, 1800-1865	348
I. The Rise of Speculative Philosophy	348
II. The Opponents of Speculative Philosophy	357
III. The Idea of Evolution	364
IV. The Reassertion of Reason	373
NOTES, VOLUME I	385

VOLUME II

XI. MIDDLE CLASS CULTURE: LITERATURE, 1800-1865	435
I. Sentimental Romanticism	436
II. National Romanticism	452
III. Emergent Realism	469
XII. ROMANTICISM IN THE FINE ARTS	486
XIII. THE SOCIAL STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL POWER, 1815-1865:	
THE VICTORY OF DEMOCRACY	510
I. The Period of Reaction, 1815-1830	510
II. Liberalism Victorious, 1830-1865	518
A. Sweden	522
B. Denmark	539
C. Norway	555
III. Local Government	567
XIV. PUBLIC HEALTH	573

XV. EDUCATION	589
XVI. LABOR AND POVERTY	617
I. Causes of the Social Crisis	617
II. Social Thought in Scandinavia	625
III. 1848	634
IV. Humanitarian Social Thought after 1851	641
XVII. EMIGRATION	650
XVIII. THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT	662
XIX. IMPROVEMENT OF THE POSITION OF WOMAN	680
XX. HUMANITARIAN REFORMS	694
XXI. DAILY LIFE IN THE AGE OF TRANSITION	707
I. General Trends	707
II. Houses	710
III. Evolution of Municipal Services	718
IV. The Elementary Necessities of Life	736
V. Manners, Morals, and Amusements	749
NOTES, VOLUME II	775
INDEX	813

CHAPTER I



INDUSTRY AND TRADE: THE PERIOD OF PREDOMINANT MERCANTILISM 1720 — 1830

When we seek the truth in geometry and mathematics we follow unfailing rules and may be sure that we shall find the truth if we accept the sum they dictate. But when, in economic and political research, we set down the sum first, as we unfortunately do too frequently (and would I could be certain I did not do the same), and when we adjust our arguments and conclusions to this previously accepted sum, what wonder that each has his own viewpoint and insists that it is right.¹

From 1720 to 1830 Scandinavian industry, trade, and finance were dominated by the mercantilistic ideal, the very existence of which indicated a desire to advance from a relatively primitive to a more modern economy. There was at first a justifiable scepticism of the individual businessman's intelligence and imagination, which seemed to render control and guidance by enlightened government inescapably necessary. Impulse, protection, and plan then came from above, not from below. But by the middle of the eighteenth century this doctrine began to be challenged by interest groups and theorists who also spoke from the vantage ground of enlightenment and who demanded freedom from paternalistic regulations. Their argument was strengthened by the obvious defects of academic mercantilism and by the signal success of the almost unregulated neutral carrying trade during the great naval wars after 1756. Prosperity and the movement toward economic freedom, however, were both interrupted by the wars in which the Scandinavian countries were involved after 1807 and by the peace crisis which followed. Not until 1830 was progress resumed.

I. ECONOMIC THEORY

For a study of economic theory in Scandinavia prior to 1720, it is necessary to go to the documents in which statesmen motivated their economic legislation; before that date there was no literature of systematic economic theory. The first Scandinavian economists were firm believers in the mercantilistic system then in vogue, not only in Scandinavia, but in all Europe. There was, however, some interesting dissent in Sweden, the result of several factors. The Great Northern War had left both Sweden and Denmark-Norway a heritage of difficult economic problems. Shorn of most of her Baltic empire, Sweden painfully realized her smallness, and resolved, in the words of Carl Carleson, to recover, by good management at home, what had been lost abroad.²

Unlike Sweden, Denmark-Norway had lost no territory, but economic recovery was there, too, of paramount importance. In both countries, therefore, the duty of the state to promote and to regulate business for the public good was readily accepted. The interest in economic theory was, furthermore, in keeping with the utilitarian and scientific spirit of the enlightenment. It was no mere coincidence that three eighteenth century Swedish technologists, Anders Bachmansson, Andr. Gabr. Duhre, and Mårten Triewald, after studying in England returned to Sweden to take offices in the economic administration, contributed to the rise of rationalistic thought, and emerged as early writers on economic theory.³

A practical attitude dominated the age; science seemed the key to the mysteries of all nature; and "political arithmetic," or mercantilism, was honored as the definitive science of economics.⁴ When, in the 1750's, the absolute monarch in Copenhagen relaxed his censorship on discussions of economic policy and permitted works on economic literature to appear, one of the pioneers, F. C. Lütken, eloquently expressed the need for that difficult ideal, scientifically objective method. Although conditions in the Scandinavian countries were favorable to an indigenous development of the mercantile theory, Scandinavian economists nevertheless owed much to foreign writers, especially, in the beginning, to the English. References to Hobbes, Locke, Josiah Child, Sir William Petty, Davenant, John Graunt,

William Temple, the German Cameralists, and Colbert abound in Scandinavian mercantilistic literature.⁵

It was not until Sweden had passed through the brief period of free trade after the war and had adopted the mercantile policy embodied in the *Produktplakatet*,⁶ that the appearance of the new economic literature began. Carl Carleson, a friend of Olof Dalin, devoted considerable attention to economics in his journals *Sedolärande Mercurius* (*The Moralizing Mercurius*), 1730-31, and *Hushålds-Råd* (*Economic Adviser*) 1734-35. Dalin himself did not neglect the subject in his *Argus*.⁷ But they were, after all, merely amateurs. Erik Salander, a disciple of Jonas Alströmer,⁸ and the manager of the Barnängen factories, wrote one of the earliest and best treatises on animal husbandry and agriculture in 1725 (*Utförlig gårdzfogde instruction*), and in 1730 he published his study of economic theory,⁹ in which he sketched the system which in all essentials prevailed during most of the eighteenth century. The central theme of his book is the obligation of an intelligent government courageously to promote manufactures, which alone can bring wealth to a poor country.¹⁰ This theme is repeated, with variations in intensity, by practically all the Swedish and Danish mercantilists. Anders Berch, whom the party of the *Hats* made the first professor of economics at Upsala in 1741, envisaged the problem more broadly than Salander, and placed almost as much emphasis upon trade as upon industry. Like other mercantilists in an age that knew little of machine production, he argued that a large working population was of paramount importance; but influenced mainly by Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, he departed sufficiently from doctrinaire mercantilism to justify luxury. To the party of the *Hats* he was the oracle on economic subjects, and his influence even extended to Germany.¹¹ Anders Gabriel Duhre also deserves mention among the Swedish mercantilists, though he was less original than Berch and less flexible than Nordencrantz.¹² What Berch was to the *Hats*, Nordencrantz (Anders Bachmansson before he was ennobled) was to the *Caps*. He began in a thorough-going mercantilism, but in criticizing the system of the *Hats* veered more and more toward economic liberalism.¹³

Danish mercantilism was much slower than the Swedish to develop a theoretical literature. This tardiness was probably

due to the tyrannical reluctance of the absolute sovereign to permit public scrutiny of his measures, whereas Sweden's system of popular representation and limited monarchy (1718-1772), together with its *Hats versus Caps* party system, made such criticism inevitable. It is interesting to note, also, that when Gustav III in 1772 restored a large measure of royal authority, the publication of Swedish economic literature practically ceased. Ludvig Holberg was apparently the only writer who defended the mercantilistic theory in Denmark in the first half of the eighteenth century. Not until 1755 did the Dano-Norwegian sovereign lift his repressive hand from economic matters, probably in response to representations by Count A. G. Moltke, the enlightened minister of Frederick V, and by one of the founders of Danish economic thought, Bishop Erik Pontoppidan. When the ban was lifted the latter published an invitation to authors, requesting them to send their treatises to Count Von Moltke; if found to be of value they would be published at public expense. Thus began, under Pontoppidan's editorship, the first Dano-Norwegian economic journal, *Danmarks og Norges økonomiske magazin*.¹⁴ Pontoppidan himself wrote *Eutropii philadelphi økonomiske ballance* (Copenhagen, 1759), a work of no great originality, which was, nevertheless, one of the first studies in economic theory to appear in Denmark.¹⁵ The brothers, F. C. and O. D. Lütken, the latter a more original and less doctrinaire mercantilist than the former, rank with Pontoppidan as founders of the study of economics in Denmark. The Danish mercantilists began writing at a time when European and Swedish thinkers were already attacking and modifying the doctrine; therefore the Danes did not advocate its more extreme measures, though they consistently defended its fundamental principles.¹⁶

Among these fundamental principles was the fanatically held belief, borrowed very likely from John Graunt, that since wealth is produced by human beings at manual labor, and since only the poor perform manual labor, the wealth of a nation will depend upon the number of its working class poor. Gold and silver was to be sought, of course, but

If all people had money enough, who would then work? What misery would not then overtake mankind? Therefore it seems to me that poor folk in a country, provided they be properly directed, are a

greater treasure and blessing, than all silver and gold, and it is not for nothing that the Lord God has made such a difference between men.¹⁷

Therefore the increase of population ought to be encouraged by every possible expedient. To that end patriotic philanthropists established funds for the purpose of supplying poor deserving girls with trousseaus, and the foundling homes and lying in hospitals which made their appearance in the eighteenth century were by no means founded solely as charities. It was this sense of the importance of population to national economy which caused the Swedish government, in 1748, to establish an office of vital statistics, probably the first in Europe and one which its interpreter, Wargentin, in the 1750's, made a model for many other countries. "The commission on tabulation of 1756 was the oldest statistical office in Europe."¹⁸ Malthus made much use of Wargentin's tables in the second edition of his work on population.¹⁹ The importance of statistics, both vital and economic, was fully realized in Denmark also; but no statistical office was established there until 1797, though censuses were taken in 1769 and 1787.²⁰

Before 1750 Swedish dissent with the theory of mercantilism was slight and almost without theoretical exponents. The chief export industries, iron and timber, protested, as export industries are wont to do, against a policy of protection and regulation which hampered them at home and provoked retaliatory measures abroad.²¹ The universal genius, Polhem, condemned monopolies and preached the heresy that agriculture was more important than industry and trade, but he did not write for public consumption. Lars Salvius' journal *Tanckar öfver den swenska oeconomien* (1738) roundly denounced gilds, monopolies and regulation, and vigorously championed the iron and copper interests in their attack on *Produktplakatet*, but he got no hearing.

After about 1749 the free trade interests became really articulate. By this time the extremely mercantilistic *Hats* had been in power long enough to offer the *Caps* obvious points of attack. The rising tide of rationalistic individualism, the growing reaction against the artificialities of eighteenth century society, with its yearnings for something more wholesome and "natural" to which Rousseau that same year gave classic expression, and the recurring unfavorable trade balance due to the

rising grain imports, all these things combined to strengthen the *Caps'* charge that the excessive subsidization was based upon false economic principles and was plunging the country into ruin. Thus was begun, in 1749, with the publication of J. Fr. Kryger's *Anmärkningar wid tre blinda fritråware i vårt samhälle*, the so-called "Strife over the Swedish factories" which lasted until the *Caps* turned the *Hats* out of office in 1765. In the course of this debate, the physiocratic doctrine reached Sweden through the writings of Mirabeau and further weakened faith in the efficacy of extreme mercantilism.²²

Among the liberal participants in this interesting discussion was C. F. Scheffer, who translated the elder Mirabeau and made the physiocratic doctrine about agriculture available in Swedish immediately after it appeared in France. These theories were further elaborated by Johan Fischerström, who was one of the first Swedes to denounce the institution of serfdom. Johan Westerman (enobled as Liljencrantz), the man who, as finance minister of Gustav III, introduced considerable reforms in the fiscal and economic administration, probably had arrived at liberal convictions before his travels in 1758-61, but he was powerfully influenced by the friendship he then established with Mirabeau.²³ But the unique and outstanding economist of this period was Anders Chydenius. He was a typical clergyman of the enlightenment, who served a parish in Finland. There he taught the raising of tobacco and introduced superior breeds of sheep; he did medical missionary work among his people and was more successful than any of his contemporaries in promoting inoculation against smallpox. As a member of the clerical estate in the *riksdag*, he represented a portion of the realm which suffered more heavily than any other in the salt-famine produced by the extreme mercantilist policies of the *Hats*. Naturally he supported the *Caps*. Although it is not known precisely how he developed his advanced liberal theories, he seems to have arrived at them quite independently. In various writings after 1761 he challenged the very basis of mercantilism; he advocated freedom for the individual in domestic and foreign trade, denied that the costs of production could be kept down by a legally established maximum wage, and held that public distrust of the state bank and its currency was to be explained, not, as officials

usually did, by the contrariness of the people, but by the inadequacy of the bank statutes. In 1763, the Academy of Science declined to award a prize to Chydenius for an essay he entered in a competition on the question of how emigration might be prevented, because his solution was the abolition of the "constraint" which to all other persons and peoples meant "order." Let the individual pursue his own profit, Chydenius declared, and the welfare of society will automatically ensue.²⁴

The result of this discussion, or more correctly, the result of the economic development that produced it, was the end of both the theory and practice of full-fledged mercantilism in Sweden. When Adam Smith's work became known there, in 1799 and 1800, the belief in freedom of trade and occupation was already widespread. The same was true of Denmark-Norway where *The Wealth of Nations* appeared in 1779. The Danish economists, Tyge Rothe, Joh. Zoega, Andr. Gamborg, and J. Ch. Fabricius, all show a careful study of Adam Smith; in Denmark, however, the last quarter of the century was dominated entirely by the land question.²⁵ The old economic theory was by no means dead in 1814, but it was badly shaken. Even the former implicit belief in the necessity of increasing population had been severely criticized, in Denmark by O. D. Lütken, in Sweden especially during the inquiry (1787) into the disadvantages of land parcellization.²⁶ When, therefore, Malthus wrote (in 1803) that Norway was almost the only country in Europe which understood the danger of overpopulation, he showed his ignorance of economic literature in Sweden and in Denmark.²⁷

II. INDUSTRY

It was inherent in the Scandinavian mercantilistic system that the governments should maintain "order," and prevent wasteful duplication of effort in the industrial system. To that end the older legislation differentiating between rural and urban activities was preserved after the Great Northern War. The craftsmen of the towns, organized in guilds, were therefore continued in possession of their privileges and monopolies. These rights the guilds always strove to render immutable, but the governments consistently retained their freedom to make alterations and exceptions. The proximity of Denmark to

Germany, with its highly developed gild system, the dependence of the Danish monarchs, after the establishment of absolutism in 1660, upon German advisers and officials, and the real need to encourage the immigration of German craftsmen produced a decided tendency there to favor the gild system. Nevertheless, the preponderance of agriculture in Scandinavian economy, and the sparse settlement of Norway and Sweden were unfavorable to the extensive development of gilds. Only in the very few largest cities was the system well established. In Denmark and Norway the inability of the government to pay its soldiers and sailors made it necessary to permit them to engage in other occupations, which frequently encroached upon gild precincts; furthermore the manufacturing gilds tended to become subjected to the *entrepreneurs*. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, the reaction against extreme mercantilism also exposed the gild monopolies to criticism. This was especially true in Denmark-Norway.²⁸ Influenced by the liberal statesman, Henrik Stampe, a rescript of April 10, 1761, sharply limited the privileges of the gilds, and after a severe strike of journeymen in Copenhagen (1794) a decree, issued on March 21, 1800, still further liberalized occupational regulation.²⁹ In the Swedish *riksdag* of 1771-1772, the gilds demanded that not even the king should be permitted to infringe upon their right to grant or withhold, through the agency of the local magistrate, applications of individuals for licenses to engage in trade or manufactures. This was a degree of impudence that Gustav III would not tolerate, and in 1773 his decree put the gilds somewhat in their places. Sweden did not, however, appreciably liberalize her gild legislation, though she watched developments in France, Denmark and Germany with great interest.³⁰

But the Scandinavian countries did not rely solely upon the gild system to produce their industrial goods. They were fully conversant with the progress made in England, France and the Low Countries, under the putting-out system and the system of larger manufacturing establishments. The putting-out system established itself here and there in the natural course of industrial evolution. There was great enthusiasm for the more spectacular factory form of production, but for such genuinely capitalistic enterprises the first essential, capital, was sadly lack-

ing. Under the mercantilistic theory this was clearly an opportunity for the state to perform a useful function; therefore, both in the absolutistically governed Copenhagen and in the more democratically governed Stockholm, systems of extensive public loans and subsidies to industry and of import restrictions were created. By an interesting coincidence it is possible to distinguish almost identical periods marked by almost identical policies in both Sweden and Denmark-Norway. The period 1720 to about 1728 is one of moderation in the application of the doctrine of governmental assistance to industry; in both realms the primary problem was to bring some order into the war-torn finances; in Denmark-Norway assistance was limited almost entirely to certain import regulations; in Sweden the sane, pragmatic Chancellor, Count Arvid Horn, the founder of the *Caps*, regulated imports for the benefit of industry and granted direct subsidies as well, although he always avoided excesses.⁸¹

In the next period (about 1728 to 1765) abstract mercantilism was rigidly applied. The instinctively bureaucratic *Hats*, by using the national bank of Sweden to pump capital into the industrial system, contributed to a new and almost disastrous inflation of the currency. The system of tariff duties and import and export prohibitions reached its maximum development. But in 1759, at the height of their power, the *Hats* could boast of an industrial production worth 6,600,000 *daler, s.m.*,⁸² and an industrial labor force of 18,231 persons.⁸³ The government of Denmark-Norway was hardly less generous. Christian VI spent over 200,000 *rdlr.*⁸⁴ thus during his reign, and between 1735 and 1746 laid down no less than twenty-five tariff prohibitions. Mercantilistic protectionism reached its climax in Denmark-Norway with the tariffs of 1762 and 1768; the former carried import prohibitions against over 150 commodities.⁸⁵ Although most of the new industries preferred to locate in Copenhagen, the government did not mean to slight Norway, for it supported the so-called *Norwegian Company* which was charged with the duty of founding subsidiary companies for divers industries. In Norway, however, there were comparatively few factories thus begun, and fewer still which survived more than a few years.⁸⁶ Both governments established credit and financing systems for manufac-

turers. The Swedish *riksdag*, in a panic of alarm over the state of the trade balance in 1726-27, provided for a Manufacturers Loan Fund to render assistance secured by notes and mortgages. In Copenhagen a public warehouse was established (1737) where manufacturers might bring goods which they were unable easily to sell and draw cash for them. The government thereupon sold the wares to retailers.³⁷ Both institutions, but especially the Danish warehouse, operated at a loss, and ultimately involved the governments in impossible financial situations.

The chief weakness of this policy was not so much paternalism as indiscriminate promotion of industries without regard to their natural bases. Polhem, in 1746, issued a sharp warning against this tendency, urging that investments should be limited to those industries for which Sweden had the basic natural resources.³⁸ The classic example of such artificially stimulated enterprises was the unreasoning support rendered in Sweden to the Jonas Alströmer establishments at Alingsås. Alströmer emigrated to London where he made a fortune in shipping, and returned to Sweden in 1723, with the assistance and encouragement of Polhem, to set up the looms and establish the working men he had managed to smuggle out of England and Holland. Thereafter he devoted his energies to introducing the potato, tobacco cultivation, sheep raising and to such a multitude of other things that he sacrificed efficiency. He enjoyed almost unlimited assistance from the *Hats*, who regarded him as a wizard of industrial organization. Yet the whole system collapsed when support was finally withdrawn, leaving as almost its only tangible result the wholly undesired one that the workers who had learned the art of textile manufacture in his shops returned to their homes to found a domestic textile industry.³⁹ Denmark was, of course, even less favorably situated than Sweden in the matter of native raw materials. Norway, where minerals and forests were more plentiful, had like Sweden the prerequisites for certain natural industries, which were the only ones to thrive.⁴⁰ In all three countries the textile industry was the object of special solicitude and it employed 14,359 Swedish workers in 1764, just before it collapsed. Tobacco, salt, iron, soap, oils and fats, glass and many other industries were also encouraged.

The general reaction against mercantilistic dogma which began about 1760 was in no small part due to the disappointments experienced in industry. These may be accounted for by several factors besides the investment in industries which under the existing economic circumstances were essentially unnatural. None of the Scandinavian countries had domestic markets large enough to warrant the large-scale production which alone would ensure low prices. A money economy was almost non-existent outside the towns; nearly everything used by the rural population, which constituted an enormous percentage of the total population, was fashioned in their own households. There was a definite limit to the amount of capital that the public authorities could safely devote to the promotion of industry; if they exceeded this limit, and they did, the credit of the states was endangered. The inadequate private capital preferred profitable commerce to unprofitable industry. The foreign *entrepreneurs* who were lavishly assisted to set up shop in Copenhagen, Stockholm, and elsewhere, were often men who had been failures in the more favorable conditions of their native countries, and almost always they failed in their new businesses, though there were notable exceptions, such as the Scotchmen Brown and Appleby in Copenhagen.⁴¹

In Sweden, the party of the *Caps*, which from Arvid Horn inherited a policy of moderation in applying mercantilistic doctrine, and which eagerly sought grounds for criticism of their *Hat* opponents, found such grounds in their economic policy. Therefore, after turning the *Hats* out of office in 1765-66, they adopted a course of retrenchment. Gustav III and his physiocratic finance minister, Liljencrantz, did not resume the subsidies. On the contrary, they lowered tariff rates and abolished many import prohibitions (1776). Swedish policy thereafter remained moderately protectionist.⁴² In Denmark, Struensée (1770-1772) leaned toward the newer liberal economic theories, but lacked sufficient time and comprehension of the problem to establish them in practice. In depriving industry of much public support, however, he incurred unpopularity among its beneficiaries.⁴³ Struensée's successor, Ove Høeg Guldberg, attempted to restore the already moribund system; when A. P. Bernstorff took over the government (1784) the newer

ideas were definitely triumphant, though caution was exercised in throwing industry back upon its own resources.

How much good—or harm—resulted from the paternalistic policy here described it is impossible to say. Certainly neither of the two realms had approached anything like industrial self-sufficiency by 1814. The almost entire absence of a modern division of labor in Sweden was noted by the German professor, Johann Georg Büsch in 1780, and in Norway by Malthus in 1803.⁴⁴ Except for Copenhagen the same was true of Denmark. Perhaps it may safely be said that labor received some education and experience in the factories which was not altogether lost. But any permanent development must rather be ascribed to other and more natural causes than governmental paternalism, such as the prosperity based on Scandinavian neutrality in the wars of the latter half of the century, or effective protection resulting from reduced smuggling after the lowering of tariff duties, and especially the growing demand for fish, timber, and iron in the countries of western Europe. Perhaps the policy of state assistance had its most important consequence, as Albert Olsen has noted for Denmark, in the development of an urban society in which capitalism might thrive.⁴⁵

During the period under consideration industrial technology was not much more backward in Scandinavia than in other continental countries. Mining, smelting, and engineering in Sweden were distinctly advanced in the early eighteenth century, and continued to occupy an honorable place throughout the period. The sixteenth century had witnessed a remarkable development of the Swedish iron and mining industries; the Great Northern War had emphasized their importance; the first years of peace gave hope of great profit. This great economic interest early prepared Sweden to accept the utilitarian ideal of rationalism, which in turn strengthened the desire to improve technology. At the universities theses were written on various mines, and metallurgical studies were popular.⁴⁶ Sweden was, throughout the first half of the century, served by one of the greatest mechanical geniuses of his day, Christopher Polhem (1661-1751), whose influence touched almost all the leaders of the country's thought. As a student he supported himself by mending and making clocks; in 1690 he invented

water powered machinery for bringing ore out of the mines, which gained the attention of Charles XI, and earned him a stipend with which to study in Holland and England. He was appointed to the nobility, invited by the Elector of Hanover to assist in the reorganization of mining in the Harz Mountains, and is said to have been offered estates for his services by George I of England and Peter the Great. His many inventions included a system of transferring power from water-wheels over considerable distances, a rolling-mill, and mechanical shears for iron foundries. He founded a mechanical industry at Stjernsund soon after his return from abroad, and from here "the power-driven shears spread to the rest of Sweden and ultimately to other countries."⁴⁷ German students came to him, and in Sweden he trained a whole generation of technologists. Polhem was so many-sided a genius that he defies delineation in a brief space. But in philosophical, educational, and economic theories, as well as in mechanics, he was well in advance of his age.⁴⁸

But Polhem was not the only technologist of whom Sweden might then boast. Anders Gabriel Duhre, physicist and economist, planned a technological institute in 1722, and though it failed to materialize Duhre became an influential teacher and author. A Swede, Liebert Wolters (also known as Sjöhhjelm), received a concession on the operation of the Rio Tinto iron mines in Spain, and with Swedish iron masters helped to revive those famous mines (1725). Mårten Triewald, the economist, lived for a time in England and apparently helped to perfect the Newcomen steam engine; at home he erected the first "fire and air" engine at the Dannemora mine in 1728, and in 1745 invented the float and lever used by James Watt. He was a member of the Royal Society. The authority of the *Caps* on economic subjects, Anders Bachmansson (Nordencrantz) had studied mechanics in England. Finally there was Emanuel Swedenborg, who with Triewald and Polhem formed the great triumvirate of Swedish technology in the first half of the eighteenth century. He, too, had studied in England, returned to take a post in the Bureau of Mines, and contrived many inventions.⁴⁹ In practical engineering skill the Swedes were well abreast of the more advanced countries. Their mines were large and ingeniously equipped; their roads excited the

admiration of travelling Germans and Englishmen;⁵⁰ and they constructed canals demanding a high order of engineering technique long before the English. Throughout the century Swedish scientists and technologists continued to study developments abroad, especially in England,⁵¹ where the steam engine and the puddling process excited the most interest.⁵²

As compared with Sweden, Denmark and Norway were backward in developing industrial technology. Beyond a few attempts to introduce the new English spinning machinery at the close of the century, attempts that were made in all three countries, little was achieved in Denmark. In Norway, where the iron, timber, and tar industries enjoyed a favorable position on the export market, there were great possibilities but no considerable achievements. The iron industry, protected both in Norway and Denmark against the importation of foreign iron, was content to employ the old methods. The tar industry improved its furnaces somewhat, and the Royal Norwegian Scientific Society, convinced that the improved furnaces excelled those used in Louisiana, tried to stimulate their adoption throughout the realm.⁵³ But in spite of the eagerness of such intellectual groups to promote technological improvement very little was accomplished. The rector of the cathedral school in Trondhjem, in 1783, deplored the backwardness of Norway as compared with England and Sweden.⁵⁴ It was in the hope Norway might emulate the industrial development of England, that Bernt Anker, whose frequent sojourns and extensive business interests there had made him almost an Englishman, presented the Corresponding Topographical Society of Norway with a Stevens drilling machine to explore the sub-soil for coal deposits.⁵⁵

In spite of the zeal displayed by governments to promote a great diversity of industries, there were but few that enjoyed real vitality. Subject to the fluctuations of general economic conditions in Europe, fishing continued to remain a primary source of Norway's national income, despite competition from the French and English Newfoundland fisheries or from Sweden in the Russian market. The increasing use of nets brought hardship to the poor fisherman who could afford only hook and line. The herring from the 1740's moved farther and farther south, finally (about 1760) invading the Kattegat to

the enrichment of the coast districts of Sweden; their vagaries were variously blamed upon net-fishing and upon God; but what one region lost by their movement another gained. Throughout the century the conditions of work and life among the fishermen of northern Norway—and fishing was there almost the only occupation—were abjectly wretched. Owners of their own equipment, they were nevertheless in a state of constant peonage, either to the merchant upon whose credit they lived between seasons, or to the Bergen wholesaler who bought their catches, or to the owner of the fishing station. This dependence was accentuated by the mercantilistic regulations purporting to maintain “order” in that branch of the economy. The Bergen fish merchants met the Nordland fishermen, when in great fleets they brought their fish to that city, with a previously determined price-list, which they well knew the men would have to accept. Naturally the men retaliated by adulterating the wares, for in the rush a close inspection was impossible. The result was soon apparent in foreign reluctance to buy Norwegian fish; therefore the government in 1753 somewhat relaxed the stringent trading regulations and laid down rules for preparing the fish. Improvements, however, were slight. But in the second half of the century, the growing consuming power of western and southern Europe together with the decline in production there during the wars, served to raise prices and afford Norwegian fishing considerable prosperity.⁵⁶ Under special public encouragement and promotion, whaling and the fish-oil industries enjoyed some prosperity. In both Stockholm and Denmark there was much interest in large-scale, deep-sea fishing, whaling and seal-hunting, but the companies proved unsuccessful. The appearance of the herring off the Swedish coast of Bohuslän in the 1750's and 1760's fundamentally changed the economy of that region, and led Sweden to capture the Russian fish-market; but at the close of the century the herring appeared in smaller and smaller numbers and in a few years this kind of fishing had to be abandoned.⁵⁷

The growth of the Scandinavian merchant fleets naturally made ship-building an important industry. In 1720 the ship-building of Sweden had already elicited some good theoretical publication and the steady recovery of the Swedish merchant marine indicates the demand upon the industry. In Norway no

such refinements seem to have developed, except to some extent in Bergen. Ship-building remained there practically a craft, in which each builder made small changes and practiced little tricks to individualize his ships. The war of the American Revolution, followed closely by the wars of the French Revolution, created a tremendous demand for ships (between 1799 and 1803, 503 new ships were built in Denmark, Norway and the duchies by 73 builders), and as tonnages were rising the result was a distinct tendency toward centralized capitalistic enterprise, especially in Norway.⁵⁸ This promising development came to an abrupt close, however, in all three countries with the outbreak of the war in 1807.

Sweden and Norway both produced small amounts of silver and copper. The royally owned silver mine at Kongsberg, Norway, showed occasional periods of profit while dire distress among the laboring population resulted in disorders which the government's agents had only sufficient ingenuity to suppress by force. The Swedish silver mines were far less important in the eighteenth than in the sixteenth century. Copper production was more profitable in both countries, although the famous Swedish mine at Falun was suffering from exhaustion. The Norwegian works, especially those at Røraas, near Trondhjem, enjoyed a profitable and increasing production which raised it to "the best business in Norway." When Dr. Clarke of Cambridge University, Mr. Malthus's traveling companion in Norway, visited these mines in 1799, he was told that they had produced some 2,146 tons of pure copper in the last eleven years. Norwegian copper was exported chiefly to Amsterdam, Hamburg, and Copenhagen.⁵⁹

Far more important than silver and copper was the Swedish iron industry. By 1680 Sweden had become the chief European exporter of iron owing to the superior quality of her ore, to the seventeenth century adaptations of the so-called Walloon process, which made Swedish iron techniques the best in Europe, to her great forests for charcoal, and finally to the solicitude of the government in promoting the industry. The Great Northern War, especially the breach between England and Sweden (1718-1720) demonstrated the close economic relationship of these two countries, for it produced a veritable iron famine in England.⁶⁰

Throughout most of the century Sweden enjoyed a practical monopoly in the international iron market, and iron was by far the greatest item in her exports. Ekegård holds that "... most of the owners of capital in Sweden were more or less directly interested in this, the only really extensive and profitable export industry ..." in the first half of the eighteenth century.⁶¹ The following table, compiled by Professor Hecksher from Swedish export statistics, which are more reliable than English import figures, indicates the average annual exportation of bar-iron in tons:⁶²

1627-1632	3,060	1718/19-1724	32,940	1766-1770	39,810
1637-1641	11,670	1726/27-1730/31	29,630	1771-75	45,070
1642	18,450	1731/32-1735/36	41,340	1776-1780	43,640
1645	16,750	1736/37-1740	40,550	1781-1785	46,810
1650	17,950	1741-45	43,640	1786-1790	51,660
1679-1680	25,880	1746-50	41,920	1791-1795	50,880
1685	26,560	1751-55	42,100	1796-1800	42,490
1711-1716	32,800	1756-1760	41,700	1801-1805	50,910
		1761-1765	45,290	1806-1810	35,610

It will be noted that until about 1731 production increased steadily (although the domestic consumption did not increase notably) and thereafter remained practically stationary. That was the purpose of the policy pursued by the government. Prior to about 1720 Sweden had enjoyed a practical monopoly also of the European tar trade, but a mistaken policy of raising prices had driven the English to produce tar and resin in the American colonies and thus destroyed this advantage.⁶³ The government was determined to prevent a similar fate for iron.⁶⁴ Convinced that the iron monopoly could be maintained only by reasonable prices, but compelled to have a regard for profits, the government deliberately restricted production in order to conserve forests and thus keep down production costs. It discouraged the construction of new furnaces, and ultimately, in 1784, (by a curious coincidence the very year in which Cort discovered the puddling process) forbade all applications for licenses to establish new bar-iron forges. In 1748, it created the *Järnkontolet* (Bureau of Iron), destined to become extremely important in the introduction of new methods, but functioning in the eighteenth century chiefly as an office of credit and control. The restriction policy secured to a limited number of iron-

such refinements seem to have developed, except to some extent in Bergen. Ship-building remained there practically a craft, in which each builder made small changes and practiced little tricks to individualize his ships. The war of the American Revolution, followed closely by the wars of the French Revolution, created a tremendous demand for ships (between 1799 and 1803, 503 new ships were built in Denmark, Norway and the duchies by 73 builders), and as tonnages were rising the result was a distinct tendency toward centralized capitalistic enterprise, especially in Norway.⁵⁸ This promising development came to an abrupt close, however, in all three countries with the outbreak of the war in 1807.

Sweden and Norway both produced small amounts of silver and copper. The royally owned silver mine at Kongsberg, Norway, showed occasional periods of profit while dire distress among the laboring population resulted in disorders which the government's agents had only sufficient ingenuity to suppress by force. The Swedish silver mines were far less important in the eighteenth than in the sixteenth century. Copper production was more profitable in both countries, although the famous Swedish mine at Falun was suffering from exhaustion. The Norwegian works, especially those at Røraas, near Trondhjem, enjoyed a profitable and increasing production which raised it to "the best business in Norway." When Dr. Clarke of Cambridge University, Mr. Malthus's traveling companion in Norway, visited these mines in 1799, he was told that they had produced some 2,146 tons of pure copper in the last eleven years. Norwegian copper was exported chiefly to Amsterdam, Hamburg, and Copenhagen.⁵⁹

Far more important than silver and copper was the Swedish iron industry. By 1680 Sweden had become the chief European exporter of iron owing to the superior quality of her ore, to the seventeenth century adaptations of the so-called Walloon process, which made Swedish iron techniques the best in Europe, to her great forests for charcoal, and finally to the solicitude of the government in promoting the industry. The Great Northern War, especially the breach between England and Sweden (1718-1720) demonstrated the close economic relationship of these two countries, for it produced a veritable iron famine in England.⁶⁰

Throughout most of the century Sweden enjoyed a practical monopoly in the international iron market, and iron was by far the greatest item in her exports. Ekegård holds that "... most of the owners of capital in Sweden were more or less directly interested in this, the only really extensive and profitable export industry ..." in the first half of the eighteenth century.⁶¹ The following table, compiled by Professor Hecksher from Swedish export statistics, which are more reliable than English import figures, indicates the average annual exportation of bar-iron in tons:⁶²

1627-1632	3,060	1718/19-1724	32,940	1766-1770	39,810
1637-1641	11,670	1726/27-1730/31	29,630	1771-75	45,070
1642	18,450	1731/32-1735/36	41,340	1776-1780	43,640
1645	16,750	1736/37-1740	40,550	1781-1785	46,810
1650	17,950	1741-45	43,640	1786-1790	51,660
1679-1680	25,880	1746-50	41,920	1791-1795	50,880
1685	26,560	1751-55	42,100	1796-1800	42,490
1711-1716	32,800	1756-1760	41,700	1801-1805	50,910
		1761-1765	45,290	1806-1810	35,610

It will be noted that until about 1731 production increased steadily (although the domestic consumption did not increase notably) and thereafter remained practically stationary. That was the purpose of the policy pursued by the government. Prior to about 1720 Sweden had enjoyed a practical monopoly also of the European tar trade, but a mistaken policy of raising prices had driven the English to produce tar and resin in the American colonies and thus destroyed this advantage.⁶³ The government was determined to prevent a similar fate for iron.⁶⁴ Convinced that the iron monopoly could be maintained only by reasonable prices, but compelled to have a regard for profits, the government deliberately restricted production in order to conserve forests and thus keep down production costs. It discouraged the construction of new furnaces, and ultimately, in 1784, (by a curious coincidence the very year in which Cort discovered the puddling process) forbade all applications for licenses to establish new bar-iron forges. In 1748, it created the *Järnkontoret* (Bureau of Iron), destined to become extremely important in the introduction of new methods, but functioning in the eighteenth century chiefly as an office of credit and control. The restriction policy secured to a limited number of iron-

masters a virtual monopoly of the industry; a centralization closely approximating a cartel was effected through the *Järnkontoret*. To assure each establishment with adequate labor and charcoal, the rural population within a certain radius was permitted to sell charcoal to it alone and permitted to pay their taxes either in deliveries of charcoal or in service to the furnace or the forge. To this regulation and favoritism of established industries there was much objection from persons who were excluded from its benefits. In 1765, Chydenius had majorities in the estates of the Bourgeoisie and the Peasantry for the abolition of the *Järnkontoret*, but the Nobility and the Clergy prevented it. Consequently the owners of the furnaces and forges, with an assured foreign market, with artificially reduced production costs, and without domestic competition, developed into one of the most powerful, genuinely capitalistic groups in Sweden, the so-called *Brukspatroner* (Worksmasters).⁶⁵

Compared to the Swedish iron industry that of Norway was small, indeed. Its methods were inferior to Sweden's, though Norwegians and Danes studied them there. But the greatest handicap was the quality of the ore, although water-power and forests for charcoal were plentiful. The Norwegian production was consequently far below the Swedish in quantity and far above it in cost. Only the severe restrictions levied against the importation of Swedish iron into Norway and Denmark in 1730,—which however did not prevent some competition from smuggled goods,—and the extensive rights and privileges accorded the ironmasters enabled them to thrive at all. But in spite of their handicaps, the Norwegian ironmasters and copper-barons became genuine capitalists and members of the economic aristocracy.⁶⁶

None of the three countries progressed far in the more advanced manufacture of iron goods. Norway had an interesting stove industry, however, where skilled wood-carvers wrought political, religious and popular motifs in bas-relief molds into which the molten iron was poured for stove plates. The industry reached a high degree of artistic development, and its stove plates were sold even in Germany. Linné saw a stove foundry at Brattfors in Sweden in 1746, but in that country the industry failed to achieve the standards that it did in Norway. Sweden had a cutlery industry in Stockholm

after 1751, founded upon the initiative of the *riksdag* in imitation of the English cutlery industries. In 1771, the Swedish town of Eskilstuna was extended certain privileges, which revived the implements industry there and started it on its way to subsequent fame. A unique industry thriving in the period when Sweden achieved an advanced position in the sciences was that of scientific instruments. Its basis was laid before 1755, and its product found a ready foreign market.⁶⁷

. . . PINE,
Hewn on Norwegian hills, to be the mast
Of some great Ammiral,⁶⁸

had long been a valuable commodity in the Dutch and English markets. In the economy of Sweden and Norway, the forests were of primary importance. If they were then husbanded less carefully than now it was not because the authorities failed to understand the need of conservation; to this the oft-repeated warnings of local officials and the decrees of the governments bear ample testimony. In the mines and forges wood then served the purposes of explosives and coal today and was therefore basic to those industries. Furthermore, timber, whether in the stock or the board, was itself a valuable article of export. Small wonder, then, that opinion was unanimously in favor of public regulation for so definitely a public interest.

The use of forests in the mining and refining industries was prescribed in both countries by regulations based quite as much upon economic realities as upon mercantilistic theory. Thus, in an age of crude transportation facilities, neither ore nor charcoal could be carried far, and the location of forges was further limited by the necessity for available water power. Therefore it seemed wise to prevent timber waste through competition for charcoal by locating furnaces at appropriate distances from one another and prescribing to each the forested area that it might exploit.⁶⁹

How this policy affected the organization of the Swedish iron industry we have seen.⁷⁰ In Norway results were similar but on a smaller scale. The records of both countries are filled, in this period, with complaints and attempted settlement of complaints by charcoal users against poaching upon one another's preserves.

It was not from using forests for charcoal, however, that Norway profited most, but rather from direct cutting and exporting of timber. Although her mines and forges were comparatively few, her vast forests were easily accessible to the great naval and lumber consuming powers on the English Channel. At first the peasants themselves had cut and marketed the timber to wholesalers; but the adoption of the Dutch fine-bladed saw mill, powered by water (instead of as in Holland by wind),⁷¹ required capital, and production was thereby more and more concentrated, a tendency which received added impetus from the monopolization of flotation facilities. By 1688 the timber industry was controlled by a class of large-scale capitalistic operators, who were that year able to persuade the government to limit the lumber sawed for export in Southern Norway to 664 mills then in operation. These mills were each assigned a maximum quantity of production. The Governmental Commission at Akershus (*Statsloven paa Akershus*), in 1717, when the demand and prices for Norwegian timber were exceptionally high, permitted unlimited cutting of timber, but refused to licence any new sawmills. The sawmill magnates were represented 3-2 on the commission. Naturally, the sawmill magnates and lumber wholesalers used their monopolistic advantages to exploit the peasantry in prices and wages, despite the efforts of the paternalistic rulers to prevent it.⁷² The years from 1720 to 1740 were difficult for the lumber capitalists, however; prices were too low. But thereafter conditions improved and the great wealth of the patrician urban families in Christiania and southeastern Norway was derived mainly from the lumber business. By 1800 the coast districts had been largely denuded of trees, despite the king's abortive but ambitious effort (1737-1746) to introduce a forestry service headed by the Germans, Johann Georg and Frantz Philip von Langen, and despite the many regulatory decrees.⁷³

Until 1720 almost no Swedish timber was cut or sawed for export; the government discouraged it to conserve the charcoal supply. But Swedish iron helped to pave the way for Swedish timber on the British market, and the south-European countries soon became bidders. In 1739 the genuinely mercantilistic point of view permitted the timber industry to attain something approximating equality with others.⁷⁴ The export, conducted

mainly from the Gothenburg districts, resulted in some tension along the Swedish-Norwegian boundary, for the more powerful Norwegian industry had achieved a foothold even on the Swedish side. In the northern provinces, later to become so extremely important, only feeble beginnings were made in the eighteenth century, but there also conscientious governors were trying to prevent waste of timber.⁷⁵

III. COMMERCE AND SHIPPING (1720-1756)

Scandinavian trade and shipping suffered heavily during the Great Northern War. In the last half of the seventeenth century, there were promising developments of merchant fleets to carry exports to foreign buyers; but the interruption of traffic and multiplication of risks attributable to the war caused a sharp decline. The city of Bergen, between 1710 and 1713, lost thirty-three ships to privateers and twenty-two by shipwreck, a total of fifty-five.⁷⁶ Other cities in all three countries suffered similarly, if not all so heavily. Dutch neutrality in the last phase of the Great Northern War, which also involved England, enabled them to regain their earlier position as carriers of Scandinavian products; thus in 1716 barely 250 tons of iron came to England across the Channel, but in 1718 nearly 8000 tons in Dutch boats.⁷⁷ What with exorbitant taxation, heavy public debt burdens, and inflated currencies, in addition to the direct losses occasioned by the war, trade was all but dead. As late as 1736 the Bergen fleet consisted of but 73 small ships with a combined tonnage of 2975½ *læster* or 1487.75 tons. The English commercial policy as embodied in the Navigation Acts, and English timber and tar production in the American colonies to answer the price policies of the Scandinavian countries did not improve the outlook. The accumulated mercantile capital had been dissipated. It was necessary to begin almost anew.

Imbued with the mercantilistic theory, the Scandinavian countries endeavored to solve their difficulties by official protection and promotion. But in Sweden the blockade had produced an acute goods-famine which had to be relieved at once. Furthermore, the currency had been so far inflated by Charles XII that strict control of the national economy was impossible until the currency had been largely repudiated and supplied with an

adequate metal base, (1719-1720). It was a case of *sauve qui peut*. The gild monopolies were abolished in order to facilitate the production of exchangeable articles, restrictions on retail trade were removed to expedite the movement of goods; foreign vessels were required to pay no higher port charges than domestic ones, for there were not enough of the latter, and tariff rates were reduced in the interest of the consumer. For this bold policy the government was rewarded by Sweden's remarkably quick recovery. But there was, to-be-sure, another important factor in the situation, namely the acute demand for Swedish iron and copper, most especially in England. Sweden's inability to sell normally during the war had resulted in the accumulation of large stores, which were now easily disposed of at fancy prices. Foreign capital eagerly helped to re-open mines and re-establish credit. Swedish capital which had emigrated before Charles XII's threat of confiscation returned. Thus the country was quickly enabled to satisfy its demands for imports at reasonable prices. By 1723 normal activity had been fully resumed.⁷⁸ This freedom was, however, considered by everyone to be essentially unsound, and the measure was avowedly merely one of emergency.

The retreat to "sounder" principles was from the first only a matter of time. In 1722, the government restored the system of "whole" and "half" tariff exemptions for Swedish ships, the amount of the exemption to be contingent upon the size of the ship, the nature of the cargo (necessary imports, especially foods, and exports were favored), and the length of the voyage (to encourage the long-distance freight traffic). In 1724 the so-called *Produktplakatet* was adopted, a measure very closely modeled upon the English Navigation Acts. Thereafter Swedish exports were to be carried in Swedish ships, and the products of foreign countries should be brought to Sweden either in Swedish bottoms or those of the country which produced, grew, or manufactured them. That this policy would offend England and the Dutch was well understood; in fact, the reluctance of the Swedes to irritate England, the best buyer of their iron, copper, and tar, is probably the reason why it was not adopted sooner. Now, however, the risk was run. The English government's objections were politely answered by reference to the established policy of the English themselves,—

who then countered by placing Russian iron on the same footing with Swedish in the tariff schedule and by reducing the duty on colonial iron.⁷⁹ The Dutch Republic replied to the Swedish policy (1729) with a futile *Retorsional Placaat*, which Sweden completely ignored. One important result of the Swedish policy was to increase by more than 100% between 1724 and 1726 the importation of French and Portuguese salt and to raise its price by about 50%; but Finnish merchants owned no vessels large enough to make the long journey, therefore a salt famine ensued which Stockholm traders were only partly able to relieve, and at considerably higher prices. This circumstance had important political consequences, for it strengthened the position of the more moderately protectionistic *Caps* in this subsidiary province.⁸⁰ In 1726, the published analysis of the 1724 trade balance, showing a large excess of imports over exports, frightened the *riksdag* into adopting still more dogmatic mercantilistic legislation for the protection of industry, commerce, and shipping,—legislation which was merely modified, not abolished during the subsequent reign of Gustav III. *Produktplakatet* remained the cornerstone of the whole commercial system of Sweden well into the nineteenth century.

Compared with Sweden's regulations, Dano-Norwegian commercial legislation was fragmentary. Something akin to the policy embodied in the Swedish *Produktplakatet* is found in the monopoly granted (1726) to Copenhagen merchants to import the four important staples, salt, tobacco, wine, and brandy, articles which were to be carried directly, and therefore by Copenhagen vessels, from the countries of their origin; but this right was removed in 1731 because the merchants of that city had been unable to establish good commercial relations with the provincial towns. The request of the Norwegian townsmen, in 1729, for a navigation law similar to the English and Swedish laws could not be granted because of binding commercial treaties.⁸¹ Lacking commodities that could be exported,—except grain to Norway—, Danish shipping made little headway until the latter half of the century. Norwegian shipping continued to decline for a few years even after 1720, due partly to Dutch and English competition, and partly to the fact that Norwegian herring ships were unable to get return cargoes in

Sweden and therefore had to go to Danzig or Königsberg for grain. But about 1730 an improvement was noticeable. Norway, furthermore, had important articles of export in her fish, timber, and iron, which afforded a basis for a merchant marine, even though F. C. Lütken, as late as 1756, mournfully conceded the improbability of Norwegian timber ever being carried abroad in Dano-Norwegian bottoms.⁸² The prohibition against importing any but Danish grain into southern Norway (1735), was certainly not a well-advised policy, but it stimulated both Norwegian and provincial Danish shipping by confining that trade to the ships of the realm.⁸³ The favored position enjoyed by Norwegian iron, timber, and glass on the Danish market operated in the same way. The government in Copenhagen was pursuing a deliberate policy of economic unification of Denmark and Norway; the latter was to buy Danish grain and textiles, and Denmark was to take Norwegian products which she did not herself produce.⁸⁴ This ambitious program broke down because the Danish textile factories were unable to produce goods of a quality and a price better than the English; smuggling resulted, and authorities were wisely cautious in enforcing the law.

Both governments continued and further developed the policy of chartering large commercial companies to promote trade with special regions or in exotic commodities. The trade with Finmarken in Northern Norway, with Greenland,⁸⁵ and with Iceland became monopolies of Copenhagen companies, and ultimately of the state, not because of a desire to discriminate against Norway, for whom that trade was historically and geographically most natural, but because it was only in Denmark that the requisite capital could be found. The Danish West India-Guinea Company (founded in 1672) continued a somewhat precarious existence on the basis of its island possessions, St. Thomas, St. Jean, and St. Croix, the latter purchased from France in 1733. A Swedish attempt to form a West India Company failed dismally in 1745. The East India companies fared better. A new Danish Asiatic Company (the first had to cease operations in 1729) was founded in 1732 and retained its monopoly until 1839. The Swedish East India Company with offices at Gothenburg, was founded in 1731, partly at the initiative of English merchants who wished to

break the monopoly of the English East India Company. In spite of the war-like opposition of the British and Dutch, the Swedish company managed to do a good business, paying dividends sometimes as high as 100%. Both governments took care to assure themselves a part of the profits; hence the companies constantly issued pessimistic and misleading statements.⁸⁶ Swedish vessels began to visit the Mediterranean regularly in the early 1730's, and a Swedish Levantine Company was formed in 1738, but since it lacked capital and never justified the monopoly it enjoyed, the government liquidated it in 1757. The General Trading Company (*Almindelige Handelskompani*), established in Copenhagen in 1747, was an ambitious effort to concentrate control of trade with the Faroes, Iceland, Finmarken, and Greenland, and to make Copenhagen the entrepot for the transit trade of the Baltic. But by 1774 it was a failure and its remains had to be taken over by the government. Instead of deriving great revenues from these chartered companies, the public treasuries incurred considerable burdens on their account, and by 1760 faith in such enterprises had waned.

Governments were no less determined to maintain order and peace in the internal distribution of goods than in foreign trade. They struggled to preserve the old-time distinction between rural and urban occupations; therefore towns continued to be assigned their respective rural areas in which they were to enjoy exclusive rights of buying and selling. As written on the statute books, Scandinavian legislation was as abstractly academic in this respect as any in Europe. But the hard facts of topography, sparse settlement, and economic evolution rendered certain exceptions necessary and the eventual collapse of the whole system inevitable. Stockholm was by law the staple emporium for the Bothnian Bay regions of Sweden and Finland, but practical experience proved that the Stockholm merchants could not adequately serve the whole region. Therefore the government permitted the important exception that the peasants of this area might bring their produce to any town they wished. Similar situations existed in Norway, where topography and distances were similar. In flat and compact Denmark and in southern Sweden the system could more easily be enforced. But it was not only the exceptions dictated by neces-

sity which helped to undermine the system of staples and privileges; the more active economic life resulting from export and import had before 1720 called into being many small unprivileged towns (*ladesteder, uppstäder*), where business was based on economic realities, where businessmen were hard-headed, and where the privileges enjoyed by the older towns were envied and violated. In these small towns and along the Swedish-Norwegian boundary, smuggling was hardly less honorable than observing the law and assumed such proportions that officials often advised their superiors against suppressing it sternly lest economic relations be completely disorganized. Nevertheless, enforcement was strict enough thoroughly to irritate the unprivileged towns and — not to be forgotten — the rapidly growing unprivileged classes within the privileged towns. During the eighteenth century therefore the struggle against the system increased, especially in Sweden and Norway. The peasants demanded freedom to buy and to sell where they pleased; the unprivileged towns complained increasingly to the governments; the proletariat in the privileged towns joined in the assault; and the holders of the privileges defended themselves in lusty memorials. The pompous language of the documents, so comically similar to the affected costumes and manners of the age, often lapses into a vulgar vernacular which brilliantly illuminates the primitive passions excited by a genuine social struggle. The contest was bitterest and won the earliest success in Norway, where topographical decentralization was greatest, where there was no political center to centralize capital also, and where each little hamlet on the coast could easily establish direct connections with foreign markets. After about 1742, the tendency of economic legislation for internal trade, and inevitably also for foreign trade, was distinctly toward greater liberalism.⁸⁷

It is quite impossible to say precisely how much of the recovery achieved by Scandinavian commerce and shipping from 1720 to about 1756 was due to the paternalism and direct assistance of the governments. The philosophy of capitalistic individualism may have warped the judgments of the many historians who have grandly condemned the whole system. At any rate, the most careful students now moderate their criticism. Professor Heckscher, the foremost economic historian of

Sweden, considers it quite likely that the *Produktplakatet* did much to develop the merchant marine of that country.⁸⁸ Mercantilism was certainly more successful in the realm of foreign trade and shipping than in industry or in domestic trade. When the Seven Years' War began there were aggregations of commercial capital in all three countries that were fully able to stand on their own feet.

Statistics on Swedish shipping indicate that Sweden possessed about 750 merchant vessels in 1693, 228 in 1723, 572 in 1762, and 664 in 1774. But between 1723 and 1774 the average tonnage per ship increased from 46 to 55 *læster* (i.e. from about 23 to 27½ tons). The average annual Swedish tonnage arriving at Swedish ports in the five-year period 1734-38 was 49.6% of the total, and in the period 1774-76 was 78.6% of the total, an increase which indicates the extent to which Swedish commerce was captured for native shipping. For this the salt trade with the Iberian and Mediterranean countries was largely responsible. Between 1720 and 1760 the value of Sweden's foreign trade was approximately trebled, though some allowance must be made for depreciation of currency and higher prices.⁸⁹

Danish and Norwegian shipping made considerable progress during the War of the Austrian Succession and afterwards. It is estimated that the Danish (not including the duchies) merchant marine numbered 585 vessels of a total tonnage of 10,543 *læster*, but this leaves out, of account the ships of the great trading companies; the Norwegian marine in the same year is put at 507 ships with a total tonnage of 23,835 *læster*. In 1766 the Danes had 619 ships (16,341½ *læster*) and the Norwegians 566 ships (36,059½ *læster*). The average size of the Norwegian ship was more than twice that of the Danish.⁹⁰ No town in Norway experienced so rapid a growth of its shipping as Arendal, small but prosperous; in 1730 it had 47 ships of a total of 3143½ *læster*; in 1760, 97 ships (7974 *læster*); in 1767, 108 ships (10,132 *læster*); but thereafter it declined rapidly.⁹¹

IV. THE REWARDS OF NEUTRALITY (1756-1807)

The evolution of Scandinavian mercantile capitalism was determined from 1756 to 1807 by two main factors, the neutrality of those countries in the recurring naval wars and the relaxation of mercantilistic regulation. The importance of wars

to the economic development of neutral countries was fully realized, especially in Norway, as early as the 1720's; and the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748) had further demonstrated the benefits of neutrality. But if any more proof were needed it was abundantly provided during the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), the War of American Independence (1775-1783), the Wars of the French Revolution (1792-1802), and the first phase of the Napoleonic Wars (1803-1807). In the latter half of the eighteenth century there was an almost unlimited demand for the peculiar products of the Northern countries: timber, forest products, fish, iron and copper. Prices were excellent during the wars, though they always dropped upon their conclusion; since foreign ships were busy, Scandinavian vessels captured, not only their own import and export traffic, but a relatively large share of the world's freight traffic.

Meanwhile, mercantilistic restrictions upon freedom of enterprise were being relaxed. Industrial protectionism had proved a disappointment; now the opportunities to profit by commerce and shipping became irresistible. Simultaneously physiocratic economic liberalism became almost a new religion. It was not so much doctrine, however, as dire necessity which forced both *Hats* and *Caps* in Sweden to the adoption of somewhat more liberal measures in the 1750's and 1760's, measures which still left the principle of the old system largely intact. The brief regime of enlightened absolutism in Denmark-Norway under Struensee (summer, 1770-January, 1772) was marked by a doctrinaire modernism pregnant with interesting possibilities, but the period of Struensee's administration was too brief to afford his measures a fair test. Therefore almost the only result was the political hostility directed at him by the industrialists and merchants whose privileges he removed.⁹² Upon his overthrow the old system of subsidies, protection, and regulation was promptly restored.

More permanent and far-reaching changes of policy were effected in both realms by subsequent governments. In 1772 the young Swedish king, Gustav III, by a *coup d'état* restored the monarchy to a position of genuine authority and together with his finance minister, Liljencrantz, embarked upon a program of economic reform. The main objective was the restoration of the currency, but Liljencrantz, a confirmed physiocrat,

believed that the permanency of currency reform depended upon a thorough liberalization of the whole economic organization. However, because he was essentially moderate himself, and because conservatism was still deeply ingrained in those with whom he had to work, the reforms actually effected between 1773 and 1783 were far from revolutionary. In Denmark-Norway, the prosaic, conservative government of Ove Høeg-Guldberg was replaced in 1784 by a new ministry dominated by Count A. P. Bernstorff. Both Bernstorff and the new finance minister, Ernst Schimmelmann, held advanced theories on government and economics; so also did most of the other ministers, and the Crown Prince, then beginning his service as Regent in place of his insane father although only sixteen years old, allowed himself to be guided. The period from 1784 to 1797, when Bernstorff died, was one of the most important in Danish history. Reforms which were to be of the utmost economic and social significance were carefully prepared and as carefully executed. The commercial legislation culminated in 1797 with the adoption of the most liberal schedule in Europe.⁹⁸

The most important economic reforms instituted in the Scandinavian countries in this period may be briefly summarized. The monopolies of the great trading companies were removed or relaxed, and new concessions were less frequently granted. In 1755 the Swedish Levantine Company was liquidated, and the Danish West India-Guinea Company lost its monopoly and its three West Indian islands, which were sold to the state. In 1772 the Danish East Asiatic Company was deprived of monopoly in the genuine East India trade and retained it only for China. In 1789 the Finmarken and Iceland trade was declared open to all nationals by the Danish-Norwegian government. The carrying trade became increasingly important, and to encourage it the unwisely selected Marstrand was made a free port by the Swedish government in 1775 and the Dano-Norwegian government established the system of bonded ware-houses in 1793. Gustav III and the Swedish *riksdag* were actuated quite as much by a desire to attract capital as by zeal for religious toleration when they decreed freedom of worship for Christian sects (1781) and asylum for the Jews (1782). Although the Swedish navigation

law (*Produktplakatet*) continued in force, it was not rigidly applied in the grain trade and was occasionally suspended in the late 1790's. The Swedish finance minister, Liljencrantz, and the Department of Commerce studied the whole system of commercial legislation between 1772 and 1778; the resulting set of recommendations looked toward the gradual but eventual establishment of what would almost be free trade. In 1776, new Swedish tariff regulations abolished several of the import prohibitions and lowered duties.⁹⁴ The greatest departure from the mercantilistic system of foreign trade was, however, made by Denmark-Norway in the tariff law of 1797, a measure which plainly reveals the influence of Adam Smith. Not even here was the protectionist principle entirely abandoned, for duties on industrial raw materials were maintained at a lower level than on finished products; nevertheless all export and most import prohibitions were removed, and the revenue motive transcended all others.⁹⁵ But it was not only foreign trade and shipping that were given greater freedom; internally liberal principles also began to prevail. By 1765, the Norwegian rural population had been almost entirely freed of its former obligations to buy and sell in certain towns. The law requiring southern Norway to purchase only Danish grain, an obligation that had produced widespread discontent in those regions, was abolished in 1788 by the Danish government. In neither Sweden nor Denmark was the same degree of freedom extended, though Liljencrantz ordained that in the towns given charters after 1779 there should be no trading privileges granted, and, what was more important, in 1775 imitated Turgot in declaring the internal grain trade free. The old economic faith died hard, however, and in 1814 there were still many minor restrictions in force. The internal customs and the officials enforcing them were bitterly hated.⁹⁶

It was quite inevitable that war-times should bring the Scandinavian countries profit and speculation, and that peace should produce deflation. Although all three countries followed this cycle, it went to greater extremes in Denmark, which had few exports of her own to occupy her merchant marine during peace as well as during war, and where capital was concentrated very largely in Copenhagen. Nevertheless, the deflationary movements never wiped out all of the gains, and the rapid

accumulation of mercantile capital was consequently characteristic of the time. It is easy to understand why the maintenance of neutrality should become the primary consideration of Scandinavian foreign policy.⁹⁷ Scandinavian products were so much in demand and so well paid for that emphasis in production was placed much more upon quantity than upon quality. Norwegian exports of timber and fish attained a maximum in 1804-1806. Farther and farther afield the Scandinavian vessels went for cargoes; the French government encouraged a direct trade centering in Marseilles and Rouen where timber, copper, tar, fish and some meat were exchanged for colonial products and wines; the Mediterranean countries loomed large in Scandinavian commercial enterprise despite the cost of tribute and piracy; the Danish harbor of St. Thomas in the West Indies was made a free port in the 1760's and quickly became a center of French West Indian trade; and the Atlantic seaboard of North America yielded commodities readily sold in the Baltic; but the most spectacular profits accrued in the trade with the Far East. The Danish East Asiatic Company's shares, nominally 500 *rixdaler*, stood at 1900 *rixdaler* in 1781; in spite of the competition of British, Swedish and Dutch companies, profits usually ranged between 10% and 30% per annum. "In the balance of trade the Asiatic commerce was the all-determining factor."⁹⁸ Only a small part of the commodities brought home by this company were consumed in the realms of the Danish monarch; the rest found markets in Holland, Russia, Prussia and Sweden. Until 1790, the Swedish East India Company was hardly less successful; between 1771 and 1792 it paid almost 300% in dividends. It specialized in tea, however, and when England reduced the duties on tea for her own company so far as to make smuggling of Swedish tea unprofitable (1790), and Holland simultaneously closed her ports to the tea of all except her own company, the Swedish company lost five-sixths of its market. Thereafter, American competition became severe, and after innumerable difficulties the company was forced to liquidate in 1813.⁹⁹

In size and numbers the Scandinavian ships grew rapidly. Privateers made many inroads, but on the other hand French privateers often sold prizes cheaply in Scandinavian, especially Norwegian, ports. New ships were added every year by pur-

chase or building. At the close of the neutrality period (1807) the Norwegian merchant marine numbered over 1000 ships, almost double the number in Denmark proper. And the Swedish merchant marine was farther advanced in relation to the economic activity of the country than it was in 1900. The years from 1797 to 1807 were marked by general prosperity, designated by the Danes as "the magnificent period of commerce," and by the Norwegians as "the good times."

In 1807 the maelstrom of the Napoleonic wars engulfed the Scandinavian countries, and brought this development to an abrupt close. Until then the wars and even the Continental System had operated rather to their advantage than otherwise. A very lucrative traffic in English goods destined for Germany had developed in Schleswig and Holstein since 1793 but ended with the bombardment of Copenhagen by the British fleet in 1807. Sweden's refusal to abide by the Berlin and Milan decrees had brought a torrent of British and colonial goods to Gothenburg and Malmö for re-export to the Baltic regions, but Russia's victory in 1809 necessitated at least some degree of observance of the Continental System.¹⁰⁰ The breach of Denmark-Norway with Great Britain was a catastrophe of first magnitude to their shipping and commerce. British privateers and warships seized in all (1807-1814) about 1560 vessels of a total value of 40,000,000 *riksdaler*, though the reprisals of Danish privateers compensated the loss somewhat. The liberal tariff law of 1797 was suspended for the duration of the war, and the restrictions of the Continental System were observed. In Norway the British blockade produced a bread-famine of disastrous proportions, which together with the rapidly growing discontent of the commercial interests impelled the Danish-Norwegian government in 1810 to agree with the British government upon a licensing system for Norwegian commerce that virtually put Norway out of the Continental System. So effective was the British blockade that even Copenhagen itself was unable to import grain freely from the rest of the kingdom; therefore bread queues supervised by the police became a common sight. The merchant classes of all three countries wanted to maintain good relations with Great Britain, but the direction of events was not in their power. The war years therefore brought ruin to Scandinavian shipping, cessation of

business and bankruptcy to the great trading companies as well as to most private merchants. Swedish iron lost much of its hold upon the English market, partly because of the interruption of trade, partly because new technology enabled England to supply herself. The grand sum of these events was that the Scandinavian countries lost practically all the capital that had been accumulated in the preceding prosperous decades.¹⁰¹

V. BANKS AND CURRENCIES TO 1814

Scandinavian economic development, especially in commerce and industry, was of course inextricably bound up with the fluctuations in currency values. The paper moneys of these countries, especially in the eighteenth century, offer the student of economic history no little food for thought.¹⁰² The great Swedish chancellor, Axel Oxenstierna, drew up a remarkable proposal for a central state bank in 1619, but the time was not ripe. In 1655, however, Charles X approved the plan advanced by Johan Palmstruch, an influential merchant of Stockholm, who studied the statutes of the Amsterdam and Hamburg institutions. The Palmstruch bank was in effect a state bank and became so completely in 1668 when it was reorganized and renamed The Bank of the Estates of the Realm (*Rikens stånders bank*).¹⁰³ The first task of Sweden after the Great Northern War was to repudiate the old and establish a new currency based upon gold, silver and copper.¹⁰⁴ Although Gresham's law operated then as always and copper drove the better coin into hiding, the paper issued on the basis of copper preserved its exchange value fairly well owing to the essential soundness of Swedish economy, so long as the conservative government of Arvid Horn remained in power. The bolder, more adventuresome *Hats* made a genuine contribution toward developing a more flexible credit system but went too far. Their rashly extended credit, together with an extravagant court, imperfect accounting, and an unjust system of taxation, soon caused a serious depreciation of the currency. When the *Caps* returned to power in 1765, they planned a gradual and sane deflation, but committed the serious error of neglecting to take the public into their confidence, with the result that business acted upon the supposition that deflation would be quickly effected. Hence, instead of a gradual, sound deflation,

there occurred a sudden, purely speculative appreciation of the currency which it proved impossible to maintain. Within one year, 1767, the currency almost reached par, only to drop sharply off again.¹⁰⁵ These violent fluctuations worked hardship upon all urban activities, but especially upon the weak, artificially incubated textile industries.

Another effort to stabilize the Swedish currency was made by Liljencrantz in 1775, on the basis of silver borrowed chiefly in Amsterdam; it involved the issue of new currency and the redemption of the old at the rate that had been current for a few years, viz. 50 per cent. But recurring budget deficits, the issue of treasury notes to finance the war against Russia, 1789-1790, the encouragement of the spirit of speculation by the introduction of state lotteries, and an unreformed system of taxation depressed even this new currency. By 1800 the re-establishment of the Swedish currency had become a problem of paramount importance, and the *riksdag* of that year, after securing for itself a greater share in the audit and control of the budget and the bank, approved the government's plan. It amounted to a declaration of bankruptcy to the extent of about 33.3 per cent., and dealt a severe blow to the holders of the old paper money (*riksgäldssedlar*). Although in August, 1803, business could again return to a currency with a silver reserve, the whole financial system rested on an insecure basis.¹⁰⁶ Upon the outbreak of the war with Russia (1808), the government was again compelled to call for loans from the bank, the more urgently since the balance of foreign payments now began to be decidedly unfavorable, and for many years continued to be so. The Swedish rate of exchange with Hamburg stood at only a little over 50 per cent. in 1814.¹⁰⁷ Not until 1834 did it prove possible to resume the payment of silver.

Dano-Norwegian currency was always somewhat depreciated during the eighteenth century, but it did not suffer the sharp fluctuations of the Swedish. The first bank in Copenhagen was the private bank of issue, *Kurantbanken*, founded in 1736. It became public property in 1773, but the most obvious result was to remove all restrictions upon its lending to the state. Chaotic accounting systems, the reckless building of palaces by the absolute monarchs, favoritism, the maintenance of a large court, the military preparations necessitated by the

Seven Years' War and subsequent diplomatic flurries,—such factors produced recurring deficits which could only partially be covered by increased taxation upon an already overburdened population and for the rest had to be balanced by foreign loans and borrowing from the bank in the form of new unsecured note issues. By 1783 paper and coin stood in the ratio of 150 to 100. The capable German financier, H. C. Schimmelmann, a member of the great reforming government, 1784-1807, wanted to unify and balance the budget and pay off the foreign debt, but his attempts failed. Only for the Duchies was anything of permanent value accomplished when in 1788 a special bank of issue with an adequate metal reserve and strict ordinances for operation was established at Altona. It proved successful at once and remained a tower of strength to the business of those provinces, but at the cost of isolating them in an economic unit separate from the rest of the realm.¹⁰⁸ Upon the outbreak of war in 1807, the printing presses were put to work to provide the funds that not even heroic taxation could furnish, and the currency printing business was popularly said to be the only one that thrived. The result could only be an orgy of speculation in an era of fantastically soaring prices and, ultimately, complete collapse. Finally, on January 5, 1813, an ordinance closed all the banks in the realm and decreed the establishment of a single central bank of issue, *Rigsbanken*, which should be provided with security to the extent of 6 per cent. of the real estate in both kingdoms and duchies. Property owners protested, and on July 9, 1813, an ordinance granted rural, but not urban, proprietors a tax reduction equivalent to five-sixths of the rent charge upon real estate,—a concession which reveals glaringly that the owners of rural estates were still the strongest social group in Denmark. Drastic plans for financial reform indicated that the lessons of the preceding years had not been lost upon the government. But it was futile. By no expedient whatever was it possible to provide the new bank with a cash reserve; consequently the new money rapidly joined the old on the course of inflation. The only consequence of some permanence was the anger felt in Denmark and Norway at the opportunity for profitable speculation which the new bank had given certain initiated persons.¹⁰⁹

Norway had a banking and currency problem peculiar to

herself. Her fishing and timber industries and her shipping made her almost economically independent of Denmark. But in spite of Norway's foreign trade, which more than the relatively domestic economy of Denmark required a sound and stable currency and ready access to capital, the recurring demand for a special Norwegian bank was persistently refused. The result was that foreign coin and bills circulated in Norway, as well as the depreciated Danish currency; in fact, the timber magnates in eastern and southern Norway, whose dealings were overwhelmingly with England, used sterling more than the national currency. The reluctance of the government to establish a special bank for Norway, as it did for the Duchies in 1788, was due to the fear of rendering the economic bonds between the kingdoms still more tenuous. But the refusal to satisfy a demand based upon vital economic facts served in the long run only to increase the rising national sentiment of Norway; and the declaration of independence in 1814 was in no small degree promoted by the capitalist classes in Norway because of their resentment at the manner in which the country's legitimate economic demands had been ignored and at the depreciation of the currency in the years immediately preceding.¹¹⁰

VI. COLLAPSE AND RECOVERY, 1814-1830

The war years began the ruin of Scandinavian industry and commerce; and the peace crisis completed it. No phase of economic life escaped. As early as 1812, an agricultural crisis began in Sweden that was to last for many years. The same occurred in Denmark somewhat later. It was, of course, only the Scandinavian phase of the general European agricultural depression, but for special reasons it lasted longer in the North, especially in Denmark, than elsewhere.¹¹¹ The lower prices of grain were felt in Norway, too, but she was a buyer, not a seller of those commodities, and her chief difficulty was finding the means with which to buy. The agricultural depression naturally retarded the recovery of industry and commerce. Peace brought with it for Scandinavia, as for all of Europe, a ruinous reduction of price levels for all of its export articles. Hardly had the effects of this first deflation begun to wear off, when the English crisis resulting from speculation in domestic and South

American securities (1825-26) again restricted the purchases of the one country which could absorb Scandinavian timber and iron. This excessive dependence upon the English market was unfortunate but inevitable. Norwegian fish, which commanded a less restricted market, recovered its balance much earlier than timber, in spite of the increasingly intense competition of the Newfoundland fisheries.¹¹² Scandinavian timber, chiefly Norwegian, had to contend, not only against reduced prices, but against highly protected Canadian timber and against other English tariff regulations that operated as adverse discriminations.¹¹³ Not until 1841 was the British duty on non-Canadian timber brought down to somewhat reasonable levels. Furthermore, Norwegian, but not Swedish, timber had in this period to pay heavy export duties.

The iron industry in Sweden and Norway passed through the most critical period in its history in the years following 1814. The marvellous development of iron technology in England, which left Sweden far and Norway farther behind, seemed to destroy the very basis of the Scandinavian iron industry. Added thereto was the drop in demand and in prices; Great Britain became herself an exporter of raw iron (1812); and Norwegian iron no longer enjoyed the right of way in the Danish market.¹¹⁴ Bankruptcies, inflation, writing down of currencies, the flight of capital, and the declining world production of precious metals (1811-1830),¹¹⁵ created a serious scarcity of capital during the period from 1815 to 1830. Both in Norway and in Denmark the governments had to pass on to private individuals part of the public loans contracted abroad. Interest rates were very high,—1.5 and 2 per cent. per month were common in Norway in 1828. "In 1831, Thomas Stang in Fredrikshald [Norway] had to pay 30 per cent. per year in interest and amortization. In 1832, Jacob Aall wrote in *Nutid og Fortid* that 18 per cent. interest per annum had long been the order of the day in Christiania, and during the years immediately following 12 per cent. seems to have been common."¹¹⁶ The return of peace and the shortage of capital ended any effective participation of the Scandinavian countries in the world's carrying trade after 1814. What remained of their merchant marines after the ravages of war found little occupation and much of it was sold or scrapped.

The era of the great trading companies was definitely terminated; the Scandinavian countries for decades henceforth imported their colonial wares second hand, chiefly through Hamburg.¹¹⁷

A large factor in the catastrophe was the instability of the Scandinavian currencies. During the greatest inflation at the close of the wars, Scandinavian capital fled in large sums to foreign financial centers, especially to Hamburg, where Scandinavian business was more than elsewhere appreciated. A natural result of this close economic relationship at a time when the Hamburg, unlike the Scandinavian, currency was stable and at a time when there was a tremendous demand for capital which the Hamburg financiers were willing to furnish—upon conditions—, was that Scandinavia became financially dependent upon the old Hansa city, and remained so practically until the panic of 1857. In that period the values of the Scandinavian currencies were regularly measured in terms of "Hamburger banco."¹¹⁸

The disastrous experiences with easy-going banking and public finance provided by the eighteenth century were not lost upon the Scandinavian governments. With the advent of peace to Denmark in 1814, the new *rigsbank daler* began to improve with relation to the old *speciedaler* (silver coin), and by 1818 was almost at par. But in that year a new bank, *Nationalbanken*, with statutes embodying the best domestic and foreign experience, was founded. The chief innovation was that the administration of the bank was independent of the government, a provision which effectually prevented even the absolute monarch from raiding the bank's resources. The new bank proved successful, and though the currency depreciated somewhat in the acute depression years 1818-1827, it survived and thereafter gradually approached par. After having stood at par from 1838 to 1845, the paper was finally made redeemable in silver for the first time since 1757.¹¹⁹ Since its power of issue made the National Bank a profitable institution at a time when Denmark was still in the throes of depression, the bank was bitterly attacked.¹²⁰ Nevertheless, by rigid economies and through loans in Hamburg and in London, the national expenditures were reduced somewhat and the debt consolidated. Gradually, order was brought into Danish finances.

The financial and currency situation in Norway in the first years after 1814 was desperate. Norway had no bank and a guarantee by the *storting* (1814) entirely failed to prevent the further depreciation of the paper money. In 1816 *Norges Bank* (The Bank of Norway) was established, but a very modest fund of silver with which to redeem some of the old currencies at a greatly depreciated rate was provided only by the heroic expedient of a capital levy; the manner of its payment—in various forms of foreign coin and in silver jewelry and plate—indicates the weight of this burden. It was an unfortunate error to locate the bank in Trondhjem, and not at Christiania, now the capital and the center of the largest business area. Furthermore the directors pursued an excessively conservative investment policy, to the great detriment of the Norwegian currency. Norwegian public finance was meanwhile in as bad a shape as possible. The war, the recurring crop failures, the cessation of normal business and the flight of capital made it extremely difficult to collect taxes; and abroad there was so little faith in the power of the new state to survive that foreign loans were obtainable only upon exorbitant terms. Thus, in 1820, after protracted negotiations, Benneche Brothers in Berlin agreed to lend the Norwegian state 555,000 *speciedaler* (the *speciedaler* was equal to four *kroner*, or \$1.08) on the conditions that the state was to obligate itself to pay the sum of 900,000 *spdl.* in 21 years and 5 per cent. interest on the larger sum, as security for which the state had to furnish 900,000 *spdl.* worth of public papers and a mortgage on the customs revenues. This was the notorious "Robbery Loan" (*Tyvelaanet*), popularly so called because the Norwegian word *tyve* means both "twenty" and "robbers." The separation of Norway from Denmark raised the problem of an equitable division of their common public debt. After bitter negotiations and intervention by the Holy Alliance, Norway's part was fixed in 1819 at 3,000,000 *rdlr. h.b.* (9,000,000 *spdlr.*), payable in ten years. It was an amazingly favorable settlement for Norway, but only by two very expensive loans contracted with the Danish financier Joseph Hambro (1822 and 1823) was it possible to meet the payments. These loans, however, and the fact that customs and port duties, the chief sources of revenue, were made payable in silver, tided the new state over its worst difficulties.¹²¹ By 1845 the carrying

charge on the national debt had been reduced to a minor item in the budget. Gradually, after some violent fluctuations during the 1820's, the exchange rate of Norwegian paper money improved until finally in 1842 it was possible to begin specie payment.¹²²

Sweden was able to stabilize her currency and to resume specie payments almost a decade before Denmark and Norway, namely in 1834. Swedish currency never took such a headlong downward course as that of Denmark-Norway, and though the depression contributed there as elsewhere to render the post war period one of great difficulty it proved possible, sometimes by resort to market operations, to maintain relative stability through the 1820's. The real question in Sweden was whether to bring the *riksdaler* quickly up to par, or whether to stabilize it and redeem it at the lower level. Charles John strongly favored the former; the majority in the Estates and the management of the bank preferred the latter. The Estates finally had their way in the *riksdag* of 1830-31, and 1834 resumption of silver payments began at a depreciation of about 37.5 per cent.¹²³ By 1843, both the Office of the National Debt and the bank held assets well in advance of their liabilities.¹²⁴

The sharp distress in all three countries upon the conclusion of peace and in Norway in 1824 was attended by the usual concomitants: criminal defaults, bankruptcies, suicides, psychological aberrations. In 1815, seventeen firms in Stockholm closed their doors. Copenhagen alone registered 250 bankruptcies from 1816 to 1820. The Norwegian urban patriciate collapsed,—in 1819 even the Anker estate in Christiania, after a cataclysmic conflagration in its uninsured lumber yards.¹²⁵ In the diary of S. Jacobs, a Jewish merchant in Copenhagen, bankruptcies and suicides are noted with appalling frequency: "May 1. The wife of the sea-captain Fredriksen in Nyhavn drowned herself. A carpenter's apprentice hanged himself. The printer, Niels Christensen, drowned himself."¹²⁶ In all three countries there were many defalcations by officers of trust. Germany, to which Denmark felt particularly akin since the union of Norway with Sweden, was persecuting the Jews, and the movement soon reached Denmark, where it was thought that Jews alone had profited by the inflation of the currency.¹²⁷

Governments did what they could to help private individuals outsize the storm. The liberal economic theories recently expressed in tariff schedules and relaxation of gild privileges were reluctantly laid aside; under the stress of domestic unemployment protectionism revived. In Copenhagen the price of bread was fixed by the government. It was an old tradition in all three countries that the people might "go to the king" in time of trouble. They did so now. The absolute, paternalistic Frederick VI of Denmark dipped deeply into his personal revenues to extend relief to the poet Oehlenschläger, whose wife was expecting a child, to a widow with young children, to this one and that one. Charles XIV John, with all the thriftiness and greed of the bourgeoisie in his blood, nevertheless bought estates of hard-pressed noblemen at prices that made profitable operation practically impossible. The Swedish *riksdag* of 1815 made provision for agricultural relief in the form of a better organized internal grain trade, loan funds, and protection against foreign competition in the form of a sliding scale of duties.

But in so widespread a disaster direct relief could only be a palliative. Relentlessly it pursued its course. Its paralyzing effects weighed heavily upon all social classes. The great commercial houses for the most part disappeared. The Norwegian Ankers and Colletts, the Danish Rybergs, Meyers, and Triers, with most others of their kind, were forced to liquidate and accept modest standards of living. With them went the glamorous, aristocratic, rationalistic culture of the late eighteenth century. The small, thrifty merchant with few commitments survived more easily and was able, here and there, by shrewd management to lay the basis for a large business. So far as the bourgeoisie was concerned the whole period (1815-1830) was one of "catch as catch can," so that when the Scandinavian countries again, toward the middle of the nineteenth century, emerged with a strong capitalistic class, few of the old names remained. What was true of commerce was true also of industry. The great export industries continued to supply foreign markets, because only exports could pay for imports; but selling at low prices made liquidations and changes of ownership frequent. In Norway the exporters threw the burden of the low timber prices back upon the unorganized petty owners of forests by

agreeing among themselves upon a price schedule, often so low as to have no relation to the price on the world market; in the face of such agreements the producer had no choice.¹²⁸ The Danish and Swedish gentry, capitalistic farmers, suffered the same fate as the commercial and industrial magnates, even though the liquidation was somewhat less complete. Those who survived most easily were the peasants, especially where, as in large parts of Norway and Sweden, a money economy had not yet been widely adopted. With few debts to pay and very little of the inflated currency on their hands, they escaped the worst effects of a genuinely capitalistic depression.¹²⁹ The small provincial towns of Sweden and Norway were forced into a stagnant humdrum activity, in which the sale of alcoholic beverages occupied a conspicuous place.

The Danish provincial towns, however, thrived better than the rural districts and considerably better than Copenhagen. Between 1798 and 1834 there was a handsome increase in the amount of tonnage entering them, and whereas the population of the country districts grew from 1801 to 1840 by 39 per cent. and that of Copenhagen by only 20 per cent., the population of the provincial towns was augmented by 54 per cent. In 1806 the Danish towns exported to Copenhagen and abroad 705,000 *tönder* of grain (one *tönne* is equivalent to 3.948 American bushels) and 16,336 *tönder* of butter; from 1828 to 1832 their average annual exportation of grain was 1,300,000 *tönder* and of butter 22,325 *tönder*. Far from indicating stagnation, these figures prove that the towns were prosperous. The truth is, of course, that Danish commerce was in process of decentralization and that Copenhagen no longer exercised its former complete domination, even though some of the small town business was done on commission for Copenhagen merchants.¹³⁰

The long duration of the "hard times," the frequency with which hopes were aroused only to end in bitter disappointment, and the painful realization that the new conditions of the world's economy permitted the Scandinavian countries only a very modest role, resulted in a widespread spirit of caution in enterprise, even resignation to poverty. Jacob Aall, the Norwegian industrialist, characterized the whole age when he wrote, "So uncertain is the course of trade in general and that of Norway in particular, that hope hovers over hard times and

fear over the good.”¹³¹ No frenzied speculation now, when improvement set in, about 1830. Scepticism even prevented the recognition of improvement. Henry David Inglis, travelling in Scandinavia in 1828 found little observable poverty among the well-dressed Copenhageners and Nathanson even declared that the city was prosperous; but Captain Frankland, who visited that city two years later, was certain that Denmark “is now lost, beyond redemption; and must become the province of Prussia or France at the breaking out of the first European war.”¹³² Frankland’s opinion was shared by many visitors to Copenhagen for many years after. Yet the decade of the ’thirties brought sound, if modest, improvement, especially to the rural districts and the provincial towns, even to Copenhagen itself. Frankland describes the general appearance of Stockholm (1830): “In the evening we went to the theatre, which is dark, dirty, and mean. The scenery is shabby; the acting tolerable; the music above par. The audience was ill-dressed and ill-looking. I never saw such a dearth of well-looking people in any city of Europe, much less in a capital.”¹³³ Generalized impressions by travellers are notoriously liable to inaccuracy, but it is interesting to note that Samuel Laing, who certainly did not flatter Sweden, declared in 1838, that “the great number of well dressed people you see in the streets seems opposed to the conclusion that the mass of the population of Stockholm is in a declining state, and sunk in misery.”¹³⁴ Material conditions were somewhat better in Sweden in 1838, yet the Baroness Ida von Hahn-Hahn, who to-be-sure looked at Sweden through very dark glasses, wrote home to Dresden in 1842 from her hotel in the center of Stockholm that “It is so still that a man’s step upon the pavement of the quay is heard long before he appears and long after he is gone.”¹³⁵ In 1828 a sailor “who alternately puffed tobacco-smoke out of his mouth, or tossed corn-brandy into it,” told Inglis that “Christiania was a sadly altered place, and that it was all owing to Lord Castlereagh”;—between then and 1838, the Norwegian customs receipts in silver *speciedaler* rose from 808,754 to 1,343,760, while those paid in paper *rigsbankdaler* declined from 502,945 to 456,166.¹³⁶ Here, too, was evidence of better conditions and slowly rising standards of living. By 1830, therefore, the period of crisis had been outlived, deflation was

complete, business adjusted to the new basis, and currencies were soon to be back on stable metal standards.

The almost complete collapse of Scandinavian industry and commerce after 1807 might at first thought suggest that the whole development since 1720 had been unsound or futile. And, as has been indicated, much of the prosperity of the latter half of the eighteenth century was built upon exceptional, non-permanent circumstances. Reflecting upon "the good times," in 1840, the Norwegian statesman and economist Schweigaard did not wish that speculative era returned. Nevertheless, all three countries retained as an enduring legacy of these decades the remnant of a genuine bourgeoisie and its characteristic ideology. There had been bourgeois groups in Scandinavia before 1720; they had even exercised considerable political power, as in Denmark when the absolutistic system was set up (1660). But they were never until the late eighteenth century able to dominate politics, thought, the sciences and the arts. The princely fortunes that were then accumulated in the great shipping centers, by the Norwegian exporters of timber and of fish, and by the masters of the Swedish iron works, enabled them to vie with the aristocracy in magnificence and even to encroach upon their office-holding prerogatives. As they broke down the barriers between themselves and the social class immediately above them, they were similarly now able to raise a little higher those marks which separated them from the classes below, the proletariat of the fields and towns. It was capitalism which now became dominant, restrained somewhat in Sweden and in Denmark by the hereditary aristocracy and the absolutistic kings, but hardly at all in Norway, where there was almost no hereditary aristocracy and where the king did not reside. Individual members of the bourgeoisie might be ruined, the whole class might indeed be watered down—as it was—, its elements remained, and with them its view of life. Therein lay the significance of the industrial and commercial history of Scandinavia in the eighteenth century.

CHAPTER II

•

AGRICULTURE: THE DECLINE OF THE OLD SYSTEM

Think of it—

To grow rich and beautiful crops for human food, and flowers and fruits to rejoice the eye and heart,

What a privilege!

Yet this today is a burden and a degradation, thrust upon the poor and despised.

The Scotch farm-lad strides across the ploughed leas, scattering with princely hand the bread of thousands;

The Italian peasant ties his vines to the trellised canes with twigs of broom, and the spring sunlight glances and twinkles on him from the cistern just below;

The Danish boy drives the herds home from the low-lying pasture lands in the sweet clear air of evening;

And the world which is built upon the labor of these disowns them, and they themselves sink earthward worn out with unheeded toil;

While the Politician and the Merchant who flourish on lies and fill the people's ears and mouths with chaff are publicly seated in the highest places.¹

I. THE OLD SYSTEM

Scandinavian agriculture in 1720 had, like that of most of Europe, long enjoyed a relatively stable social structure and technique. It had continued for centuries with but one object, —to supply the cultivator and his immediate family with the most elementary necessities. The profit motive, soon to become the mainspring of economic and social evolution, was practically unknown to agriculture, and when it appeared it came from the towns. Even on the estates of lords there was almost no thought of accumulating a surplus to form capital for new or larger enterprises. The known exceptions merely prove the rule. Therefore the son was content to occupy the father's place and content to employ his tools and methods. So long

had this been true that tradition had become a determining factor, respected and valued for its own sake—a positive force when it maintained a certain standard of culture, negative when it resisted improvements. Tradition was a stabilizing force. But it was a rudimentary agriculture that was so stabilized. This type of cultivation provided the barest possible margin of safety. There was no tradition to prevent destruction by armies, civil or foreign; there was no power in tradition to regulate the capriciousness of weather, especially uncertain in the north where the long arms of winter too often reached over the shoulders of spring and autumn; nor were the pestilences that afflicted man and destroyed his beasts any observers of tradition. A Supreme Governor who could regulate what man could not he firmly believed there was, and to Him he turned in prayer. But even He did not seem quite without whims.

In the old rural society there were many kinds of land tenure, and tenure was of very heterogeneous origin. The village and strip system dated back to prehistoric times, but since its establishment many forces had operated to alter its development. The widespread influence of the feudal idea, together with the holdings of the medieval church and the desire of the state to facilitate the collection of taxes, assure itself of adequate defense, and promote the increase of population,—these were but some of the factors which had played upon the primeval relationship between man and land. It is impossible here to attempt an evaluation of the importance of each in producing the varied forms of tenure prevailing in 1720; but it is well to remember that the variations may be largely accounted for by these socio-political factors and to a lesser degree by topography.

Large estates were known in the earliest sources of Scandinavian history, and the passage of time had not diminished their numbers. During the middle ages they had, in all three countries, served the purpose of military organization, and their noble owners had been accorded liberties, powers and privileges which created a dominant upper class exactly as in the rest of Europe. The Crown was always a large landowner, and of course enjoyed no fewer advantages than the nobility. The lands of the Crown and of the nobility were cultivated by peas-

ants, who, if they were not actual serfs in the purely feudal sense—for genuine feudalism never succeeded in establishing itself in these countries—, were nevertheless forced to pay their rents in labor and in kind. The amount of land in large proprietorship varied from time to time; now the nobility would encroach upon that of the Crown, now upon that of the freeholders;² then the Crown, or ordinary economic circumstances, would force the nobles to disgorge some part of their holdings,³ or the Crown itself would expand at the expense of the freeholders. Another class of landed proprietors, namely the bourgeoisie, from about the middle of the seventeenth century became increasingly important. Industry was backward, there were limits to the possibility of reinvestment in trade, and the possession of land was the surest way to social recognition, therefore Scandinavian merchants, like those of England and of France, bought estates.⁴ In Norway many large estates owed their origin to the fact that owners of mines and forges purchased forest areas to assure themselves of an adequate charcoal supply. This was especially true in the eighteenth century.⁵ Finally, the large estates were to be found wherever topographical conditions made agricultural village life possible, especially in Denmark, southern and central Sweden, and in the south-eastern and Trondhjem regions of Norway. Generally speaking the system of large estates could not be supported by agriculture alone in the more mountainous and more heavily forested regions and in the northerly parts; but important exceptions must be noted.⁶

The condition of the common peasants who lived on the estates varied considerably, from place to place and time to time. As early as 1702, the Danish monarchy took the unprecedented step of abolishing serfdom in the Islands, where alone in Denmark proper it then existed. But the militia system established the year before continued for almost a century to bind the peasant to the place of his birth. Therefore the actual cultivators of the soil on the estates were tenants who occupied their plots under the most varied regulations. In almost all of Denmark and in the Swedish lowlands, but on only a few estates in Norway, their position was but little better than that of the German serfs, and with respect to tenure it was sometimes more precarious. Although tenure for life and

even hereditary tenure was often established by custom or rendered practically necessary, tenure for a term of years was common, at the end of which the owner might renew the lease, or not, as he pleased.

Independent ownership of family farms, or *virgates*, had from the age of the sagas been a primary form of land tenure in the Scandinavian countries, and though it had suffered many vicissitudes it was still, in 1720, highly important. It varied in strength, however, inversely in proportion to that of the system of estates. There had been a constant ebb and flow between individual farm ownership and large proprietorship varying in intensity and extent with economic and political circumstances. In Denmark, where the influence of the feudal system was greatest the estates had encroached more and more upon the yeomanry, especially between 1660 and 1720, until but a small fraction of the soil was in freehold. The peasants there had no political power. In Sweden the nobility reached the climax of their strength in the time of Queen Christina and Charles X, but under Charles XI they were forced to return much of their land to the Crown and to freehold. In Norway, where the native nobility died out at an early date, the system of individual ownership held its own fairly well, both against the Crown and against the immigrant Danish nobility.⁷ The last quarter of the seventeenth century marked, for both Sweden and Norway, a turn of the tide for individual farm ownership which thereafter became progressively stronger. This was due in the main to the sale of crown lands, either directly into freehold, or indirectly into freehold through bourgeois land speculators. Charles XII, whose need of money was insatiable, allowed crown tenants to purchase their holdings, but it was only late in the eighteenth century, when the growing grain trade had introduced the profit motive, that economic conditions seemed to the tenants to justify an exchange of crown tenantry for taxable freehold,⁸ encumbered as the latter was with almost as many services and dues as ordinary tenantry.⁹ In Denmark-Norway, also, the alienation of state properties was caused by the monarchy's need of money. Hence crown lands, and even churches, were sold to anyone who could pay a price, off and on after 1660, in both Denmark and Norway. In Norway land speculators and officials at first pur-

chased them, but after a sharp struggle between the peasants and the officials in the early 1680's taught the crown tenants the wisdom of full ownership, they entered the market in strength. The opportunities for profit by industry and trade which the 1680's and 90's presented furthermore tempted many private proprietors to sell their lands at the very moment that prices of farm products ceased to rise and the price of land, due also to the large offerings of crown lands, began to decline.¹⁰ Thus was inaugurated a movement which, by 1750, had altered the proportions of owners to tenants from 1:3 to 2:1.¹¹ Nothing of this sort, however, occurred in Denmark. There the creditors and the courtiers got the land, even after 1764 when the Crown definitely planned to sell in small parcels.¹² The fundamental economic reason for this result in Denmark was the transformation of Danish agriculture from cattle-raising to grain-raising. Grain farming was now more profitable than cattle raising and required large fields and plenty of labor.¹³ The whole Danish movement was, at this stage, closely analogous to the English enclosure process.

Several factors had combined until the beginning of the eighteenth century to prevent a very extensive subdivision of individual farms. Population had not increased rapidly; and the small increase had found an outlet by clearing forests. Furthermore, in Sweden and Norway there had been a powerful social tradition to conserve the unity of the family holding; because wherever the system of large estates had not established itself too firmly, the social position of each family depended upon maintaining its landed property from generation to generation. The independent peasants of Norway and Sweden formed a virtual aristocracy, able in many cases to trace their lineage back upon the same farms to the chieftans and kings of the saga age. In Norway this urge towards family self-preservation had found expression in a customary law called the right of *odel*, whereby the ranking male member of the original family of owners might within a specified term of years (usually twenty), repurchase the farm at a favorable price. Obviously such a rule must operate to restrict the freedom of the land market. In all three countries, but especially in Sweden and Norway, there developed under these circumstances a customary system of inheritance which so far as the land was con-

cerned, practically amounted to entail, though it was not always the oldest son who inherited. In Sweden, furthermore, the whole system of national revenue depended in large part upon a fixed assessment in kind upon each *hemman*, or farm, and it therefore became a conscious object of land legislation to preserve its tax-paying power. But this would obviously be reduced in proportion as its lands might be reduced; consequently the law was until 1747 definitely hostile to the parcelization of the individual farm (*hemmansklyfning*).¹⁴ The ideal was that each farm should be large enough to provide not only a modest competency (*besutenhet*) for the family upon it, but also its proportion of the taxes.

In addition to the proprietors, the farm owners and the tenants, there was a social group that might be called crofters.¹⁵ Historically this group was almost as ancient as either the large proprietors or the individual farm owners, for crofters were natural to the moneyless economy. When wages could not, except with great difficulty, be paid to labor in cash, it was necessary to pay in part with land and in part with cash or produce or both. The crofter was always a married man, usually a former servant, occupying a cottage and tilling the soil allotted to it for part of his living, but subject to labor on the land of the owner at low or fixed rates. When money, during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, came to be used as the medium of rural economic relationships, it became customary to pay labor entirely in cash and produce; consequently crofters with no land became more and more common. Crofters with land and grazing rights, either on the common or on the owners' pasturage, were always poor and sometimes wretched, but at times they might be even better off than tenants, especially in Denmark. The servant class, from among whom the crofters were usually recruited, consisted of young people of both sexes, ordinarily the children of the crofters, and old people, ex-crofters beyond the age of heavy labor, whom it was customary for the owner to support.¹⁶ More and more throughout the eighteenth century the pressure of increased population diminished opportunities for agricultural employment, depressing the lot of these laboring classes, and culminated finally, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, in a grave social crisis.

The background of this slow economic tragedy was the communal village, except in a few regions,—western Jutland, northern Sweden, and northern Norway—, where topographical conditions made settlement especially sparse. A detailed description would take account of innumerable variations from village to village, but would also show certain fundamental similarities. Dating, like the agricultural villages of all Europe, to some period in the primitive past, the communal villages represented an adjustment of man to land and to others of his kind. Under the dictates of experience, this adjustment underwent a gradual transformation, as community ownership changed to individual ownership, so far as the ploughed areas were concerned, and the institution of strip rotation changed to fixed holdings. It is evidence of the nearness of the Scandinavian countries to primitive conditions that the rotation of holdings was practiced in a few Swedish villages as late as the middle of the eighteenth century. They were, however, belated exceptions.¹⁷ The system of fixed, individually owned, but scattered strips was then of old age; it was in fact in Denmark already giving way before that of capitalistic grain farming on large estates. The common forests and pastures, however, continued to remain the property of the community, even though the introduction of conacre farming in the Danish islands caused some commons to disappear soon after 1750.

Cultivation techniques in the agricultural village were governed by social experience as transmitted in tradition. To inveigh against them as being stupid because from a more advanced point of view they were wasteful is to speak without historical perspective. At the opening of the eighteenth century, and in the main even a century later, the processes of preparing the soil, planting and harvesting, were carried on communally. There existed no possibility in the open fields with their intermingled small strips for any worthwhile individual enterprise. And against any upstart individualism, against every assertion of private judgment, the apparently inert mass of social conservatism would inevitably turn with speedy vengeance. The village was the world of the villager; its wrath as formidable as that of God Almighty. The village patriarchs in meeting assembled decreed the beginning, the methods, and the end. It was a crude but expedient practice, for under exist-

ing conditions the food supply of the group could not be jeopardized to satisfy a member's craving for experiment. Infractions of the village code were punished with fines, often payable in spirituous liquors to be consumed by the members of the community upon festive occasions.

The rural population in the Scandinavian countries was, as elsewhere in Europe, subject under the old system to a variety of special burdens. The commonalty was regularly subjected to a land tax from which the nobility was wholly or partly exempt. This differentiation had originally been justifiable, for the nobles then performed necessary military and civic functions which could only be performed under and compensated by such exemption. The moneyless system of economy and consequent feudal influences made differentiation necessary.¹⁸ But conditions had changed, and lords no longer performed services in proportion to their privileges. Although the burden of military service now rested upon the rural youth, the wars of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries had necessitated the levy of special taxes, from which the lords continued to be largely free. A second special burden on the rural population was the old and formerly natural obligation to labor upon the estates of the lords. The number of peasants so obligated varied with the prevalence of the system of large estates. In Sweden there were no great changes in the eighteenth century, and in Norway the number of estates declined sharply. But in Denmark it increased. There the crown tenants, who usually performed little or no compulsory labor, were brought under owners of estates together with their lands. To make matters worse, the government in 1701 to recruit the army, and again in 1733 deliberately to assure proprietors a labor supply, decreed that male rustics between the ages of 14 and 36 might not leave the parishes of their birth (*staunnsbaander*) without the permission of their lords. Thus a virtual serfdom was re-established.¹⁹ But since this occurred at a time when absentee landlordism was increasing,²⁰ the peasants were squeezed more than usual to provide the lord with a suitable establishment in the capital besides a profitable living for the manager. It is safe to assume also that the familiar desire of proprietors, rapidly adopting the capitalistic viewpoint, for heavy profit from the rising grain prices after 1731, greatly increased the burdens of labor.²¹ The

amount of labor which a proprietor might require was fixed neither by law nor custom, and therefore, despite the king's oft-expressed interest in the peasants, their condition grew progressively worse. The consequence was that the Danish peasant, unable to believe in a future, working always for others and not for himself, adopted the slogan: "Better become poor by sleeping than by working."²²

There were other burdens, too, which weighed heavily upon agriculture. The tithe continued in many places to be collected in the sheaf rather than in money,²³ a practice which often delayed the gathering of the crops beyond the term of favorable weather. The construction and maintenance of roads devolved upon the rural population, and this obligation became the more appreciable as the eighteenth century brought a marked revival of road-building. Besides this *corvée*, the farmers along the highways were required by law to keep horses and drivers in readiness to transport passengers and goods. The king and persons travelling on his business were to be carried free, others must pay according to a scale of charges that the farmers always considered too low. Perennial were the complaints raised on this account, complaints against taking of horses from necessary work, against abuse of the animals by travellers, against inadequate fees, and against the humiliation which the imposition of this obligation implied. Along only a few parts of the new highway system was traffic considerable enough to bring income to the peasants. For the rest it was only an annoyance. Partly from sheer paternalism, partly from a desire to promote the textile industry, the governments attempted from time to time, always with little success, to prescribe what the rural population might wear. And impelled by the mercantilistic motive of providing labor for industry, decrees were promulgated in Sweden, the first time in 1686, limiting the number of grown children and servants that a peasant might keep on his farm. In the next few decades the wind of economic theory turned and in 1747 these restrictions were removed by the Estates, chiefly in order to encourage the growth of population.²⁴ But the peasantry still continued victims of legislation favorable to industry, especially the iron and mining industries which needed charcoal and transportation. And this was true in Norway, as well as Sweden.

Needless to say, the methods of production were primitive. Throughout the middle ages man had in Scandinavia waged a continuous warfare with the wilderness; conditions were characteristic of frontier settlement, even in parts of Denmark. In the eighteenth century the bear had long been extinct in Denmark, but wolves were not exterminated until about 1770. The hunting privileges of the nobility were a curse to the cultivator, serving both to humiliate him by making him a beater and to protect the game that damaged his crops. In Sweden and Norway bears, wolves, and foxes continued to be a menace to live stock until past the middle of the nineteenth century; as a matter of fact, Norway exported many furs until about 1750.²⁵ A cursory examination of Scandinavian folk-lore, where animals have the familiarity of human beings, will indicate how close human life was to the primeval.

Parts of Småland, Dalarne, and the northern sections of Sweden, generally influenced by Finnish immigration, prepared the soil by a primitive system of felling, drying, and burning the trees on the area to be sown, which was then fertilized by working the ashes into the earth.²⁶ Although out of solicitude for the forests as the basis of the charcoal supply, the government from the time of Gustavus Adolphus endeavored to stamp out this practice, it still lingered as late as 1800.²⁷ Certain members of the gentry in all three countries were from time to time abreast of the best agricultural theory in Europe, and sometimes they prepared manuals for the use of others. But the masses they could not reach, and not even many of their own class accepted their suggestions. Therefore ploughing continued to be done in the spring, rather than in the autumn, the soil got very little preparation beyond a coarse harrowing, and fertilizing remained extremely rudimentary. The peasants had little understanding of the importance of good seed; Linné relates that about the middle of the eighteenth century it was a nation-wide superstition in Sweden that if the yield of a field were a mixture of wheat and rye evil powers must have changed part of the seed from wheat to rye. Linné also complained of the manner in which manure was wasted by the custom of spreading it upon the surface without working it into the soil, and in his eagerness to improve agriculture even wondered if cemetery soil would not prove good fertilizer. Norway

produced good fertilizer by burning kelp, but exported it to Scotland, except during the period 1765-1778 when kelp-burning was forbidden in the belief that the smoke frightened the fishes away.²⁸

Implements were very primitive. Wherever land was reasonably flat, the ancient heavy wheeled plough prevailed, elsewhere every district had its own type. None of these ploughs did much more than move the topsoil in the course of time to the center of the field.²⁹ Even an iron ploughshare was a novelty in the middle of the eighteenth century. Spades, which in the most mountainous districts often did service for ploughs—and worked more deeply—had but an edge of iron. Harrows were often but stocks from trees bound together, with a few inches of branches left on the stocks to serve the purpose of tines. Linné, in 1749, found a flexible harrow in use in Småland, Sweden, which he took pains to illustrate and describe in full detail; but a few decades later a flexible harrow, equipped with iron pegs and developed in Norway, was heralded as a “discovery.” The flexible harrow could follow an irregular surface. Experiments with seeding machines had been made in the early eighteenth century, *e. g.* by Christopher Polhem, but such contrivances were not in use a century later. Threshing continued to be done in the manner of ancient Egypt by flail or oxen.³⁰ Variations of the two- and three-field systems were in use everywhere until after the beginning of the nineteenth century, in spite of many efforts at reform, and in the backward mountain regions, single fields were sometimes replanted year after year, usually with oats, until the yield declined to three-fold and even two-fold.

In the matter of animal husbandry Scandinavian practice was, on the whole, no less backward. Breeding practices were somewhat better on the large estates than in the villages; at any rate cattle were larger there, and more productive, though the types were well mixed. The better care that the estates were able to give their herds largely accounted for the difference. For the masses selective breeding was impossible, since their cattle grazed together on the common or on the stubble, where quite in the course of nature they bred to the lowest common denominator of quality. The care, especially the feeding of the cattle, was such as to enable only the strongest animals to sur-

vive; consequently the Scandinavian breeds developed into small, hardy creatures, productive of little beef or milk. The winter was a period of suffering. Fodder consisted only of hay, straw, and leaves, and short rationing became an art upon which the dairy maid prided herself highly. The early spring was frequently a time of death from starvation, until the survivors could be put to grass, for every farm kept as many head as possible through the winter. Shelters were usually wretched—small, dark, and damp—; and since no effort was made to keep the animals clean, skin diseases were common. Scientific treatment of cattle diseases was practically unknown until the eighteenth century when the recurring epidemics and the beginnings of French veterinary science created the necessity and provided the means to combat the traditional reliance on magic.³¹

Only in Denmark was there any systematic fattening of animals, chiefly steers, for export and in the islands of the kingdom this practice was declining in favor of extensive grain cultivation, whereas the Jutlanders continued when the market permitted to drive their fattened herds south into Germany and Holland. This, and the fact that cows gave little or no milk during the winter, made dairying extremely primitive. Imported Dutch dairymen introduced better methods on the Danish estates during the eighteenth century; such establishments were called *Holländerier*.³² The motive here was the genuinely capitalistic one of profit by sale, either at home or abroad. Although pigs and poultry were always plentiful under the pre-capitalistic system of agriculture, their feeding and breeding were undeveloped arts.³³

The chief reason for this primitive husbandry was that opportunities to dispose profitably of a surplus and to supplement a short crop by purchase were strictly limited. In Denmark easier means of transportation, compact settlement, and proximity to European markets had helped to break down somewhat the provincial isolation that still existed in the other countries until late in the eighteenth century. In Sweden and Norway foreign importations of grain, butter, and meat were available almost only to the cities and the coastal districts. Under such conditions the whole bourgeois capitalistic ideology of investments for larger returns, of accumulation, of improve-

ment in technique, the "bigger and better" philosophy, could not develop. Since the incentive for breaking with the traditional order was lacking, each regional community was very largely self-dependent. Crops were of paramount importance. When they failed, hunger or outright famine threatened. Famines were not unusual in Swedish and Norwegian history; even Denmark suffered one in 1708-09; but those of the eighteenth century attracted far more public attention, in itself a promise of improvement. Nevertheless there were certain factors that operated actually to aggravate want. Even in good years the common people of the interior subsisted on a meager diet, mixing their flour with ground up bark and other substitutes. Their resistance to disease was therefore normally low. Population was increasing more rapidly than the food supply; and when, in the latter half of the seventeenth century, the peasants began to distil spirits from grain, the margin of supply was at first still further reduced.³⁴ There were particularly lean years in Norway and Sweden in 1740-43, 1771-73, 1780-86, and 1798-1800. There were sporadic famines even after 1800 in districts which were inaccessible to transportation, *e. g.*, in the Norwegian upper Telemarken and Numedal, in 1838. Malthus was an eyewitness to one of these local famines in 1799, in the Swedish provinces bordering on Norway. His description fits them all:

The cattle had all suffered extremely during the winter, from the drought of the preceding year; and in July, about a month before the harvest, a considerable portion of the people was living upon bread made of the inner bark of the fir, and of dried sorrel, absolutely without any mixture of meal to make it more palatable and nourishing. The sallow looks and melancholy countenances of the peasants betrayed the unwholesomeness of their nourishment. Many had died; but the full effects of such a diet had not then been felt. They would probably appear afterwards in the form of some epidemic disease.³⁵

Government measures for the relief of famines were pitifully ineffective, and were based as much upon days of prayer as upon practical action. In both countries the authorities relaxed the burden of taxation on such occasions, and attempted to purchase and distribute food, but only to a palliative degree. The only effective remedies, the development of an internal trade in agricultural products, better transportation, and better

methods of production, brought with them the end of the pre-capitalistic system of agriculture.³⁶ But while that system lasted man's precarious hold upon the means of subsistence put its stamp upon every phase of life.

Whether in the eighteenth century, or any other, the lean years in the long run delayed the increase of population is at least dubious. It is easily demonstrable that they served momentarily to raise death rates and lower marriage and birth frequencies; but on the other hand the very deaths made room and created opportunities for employment, which, in turn, as soon as crops seemed to warrant, led to higher frequencies of marriage and childbirth.³⁷ At any rate population increased quite rapidly enough to create important social problems. Political unrest among the peasants was frequently a concomitant of crop shortages and hard times. Malthus marveled at the patience with which they bore afflictions, but history shows that the perpetual war of attrition between the rural population and the officials always became more acute at such times.³⁸

II. THE OLD SYSTEM CHALLENGED

Although the ancient agriculture thus far described in all essentials outlasted the eighteenth century, it was, especially in the latter half, severely attacked. Elsewhere in western Europe increasing density of settlement was intensifying agriculture; this was also partially the case in Denmark, but Sweden and Norway, where extension was still possible by clearing waste lands, did not feel the same compelling motive for intensification. Nevertheless, the rising influence of the bourgeois ideology, expressed in the science of economics, was evident when it was accepted as a proper subject of study fit to be placed alongside theology itself in the universities. Under this new trend agriculture, far more basic then than now, was inevitably subjected to analysis. And since the analysis proceeded from the bourgeois, that is the capitalistic point of view, it necessarily emphasized, 1: the importance of private property and enterprise, 2: profit, or excess of return over investment, and 3: technology as the means by which profits and property might be increased.

It was natural that mercantilism should at first, since it emanated from the towns, be concerned primarily with urban

activities. This was so in the Scandinavian countries. Mercantilism, in its earliest stages, rather despised agriculture, or at best viewed it as the handmaiden of the more elite urban occupations, which alone presented opportunities for calculable profits. These theorists held that agriculture, in addition to providing food, under methods then believed unimprovable, could actually serve the state only by increasing population, and hence the labor supply, and by producing certain raw materials. Hence Sweden, for example, in order to increase the number of charcoal burners in Dalarne, as early as 1725 permitted the subdivision of farms, and in 1747 extended the permission to all farmers in order to increase the population. The Dano-Norwegian law of 1769 was also intended to increase population. Even the representatives of the peasants themselves used the mercantilistic argument for an end that they held to be intrinsically desirable.³⁹ The mercantilistic industrial foundations and emphasis upon shipping naturally raised the importance of producing raw materials,⁴⁰ and here it was sometimes difficult to differentiate between industry and agriculture. But obviously a country would benefit, according to the theory of national self-sufficiency, if it could produce its own wool, its own flax and hemp and tobacco. To that end individuals and governments did their best to introduce good foreign breeds of sheep, and to encourage the cultivation of certain crops. Typical of the practical mercantilists was the Swede, Jonas Alströmer. A leader in the founding of the textile industry, he was also responsible for the introduction of Spanish and English sheep and became the general superintendent of the public system of sheep-breeding stations throughout the country. He was apparently the first man in Sweden to plant potatoes and tobacco, both in the 1720's.⁴¹ Similar efforts were made in Denmark and Norway, but none of the three countries saw much progress.

The intrinsic, and not merely ancillary, importance of agriculture began to be recognized in the 1740's.⁴² Two decades later the interest in it had grown to such proportions that to men of the old school it seemed to be a mania, or as K. G. Tessin termed it, "agromania."⁴³ The great pioneers of the enlightenment, Olov Dalin and Ludvig Holberg, had both inveighed against the social degradation to which the peasants

were subject,⁴¹ but only the operation of inexorable economic processes and the influence of foreign ideas elevated agriculture in the public esteem. The recurring excess, in the seventeen twenties and 'thirties, of grain imports over exports, strange to say, had not aroused the Swedish mercantilists, usually so concerned about the balance of trade, to any vigorous efforts on behalf of agriculture. But in the 'forties, 1744 to be exact, an argument over the relative merits of industry and agriculture was conducted in the Academy of Science' where the chief of the National Surveying Office, Jacob Faggott, championed the latter. This argument attracted much attention, and marks the beginning of the Swedish "agromania." It deserves to be noted, however, that the government had already, in 1740 and 1742, given provincial governors instructions to promote a more progressive agriculture and the breaking of new soil, in order to reduce grain imports and increase domestic production.⁴⁵

In 1742 the Swedish Estates proposed a plan for the encouragement of individual enterprise. It was transmitted by the government to the provincial governors with instruction to secure the consent of the villages. If any one should invent any tool or machine, or should have any plan whereby the work of the village would be improved, he was to propound it to the village council. If they should reject the idea, it was to be submitted to a committee from outside the village, and if the committee should favor it, those in the village who had opposed it might be fined. Only the two northern provinces, where the village system was not firmly entrenched, accepted the plan, which was altered and renewed in 1842. Linné, commenting upon Scanian agriculture in 1749, was sure that a drastic reorganization must precede improvement, for nothing could be done to change the old inefficient methods until the peasants should be "separated from one another" by strip consolidation.⁴⁶ The continued excess of imports served thereafter as a red light of warning that all was not well, an impression that was deepened by the repeated crop failures and famines.

The unfortunate experience of Denmark with the system of large estates, to which the peasants were bound, and upon which they were compelled to labor, served there to center public attention upon agriculture. The peasants were poverty-

stricken and ignorant; since their labor netted them no returns, they shirked their duties and often abandoned their holdings, preferring the life of the sustained pauper to that of hard, unrequited toil. The proprietors themselves had to bear no small part of the poor relief, and after cattle-epidemics frequently had to supply their tenants with new herds.¹⁷ Then, if ever, there was "something rotten in Denmark." At first the proprietors could think of no way out other than binding the peasants still more fastly to their estates and increasing their obligations; therein the government favored the proprietors. But after 1750, as the result of experiments by certain Holstein proprietors with consolidation of strips and abolition of compulsory labor, the more progressive members of this vested interest group began to lose faith in the system. In 1746, Count Adam Gottlob Moltke had proposed a plan of government to his master Frederick V, which pointed to the superior methods of agriculture practiced in Holstein, and urged the king to promote their adoption in Denmark.¹⁸ To provide the government with expert advice on this and other economic matters, Moltke prevailed upon the king to invite the public to send in their treatises; these were to be published in Erik Pontoppidan's *Danmarks og Norges oeconomiske magazin*. Thus freed from the fear of being charged with *lesè majesté* for presuming to criticize the arrangements of the sacrosanct absolutism, many writers on economic and agricultural subjects appeared. With the first number of this journal, in 1757, the Danish and Norwegian "agromania" broke forth in full strength.

Needless to say, the active interest displayed abroad in agricultural reform was not without influence upon the Scandinavians. The work of Frederick the Great was studied closely. German cameralists, especially von Justi, strengthened the emphasis upon population and the consequent necessity of an adequate food supply. And in the German-speaking parts of the Danish realm, especially Holstein, proprietors first demonstrated what could be accomplished by a complete breach with the old agricultural system. French literature contributed the physiocratic doctrines which had many, if not always strict, followers in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway,⁴⁹ and very well counteracted the previous one-sided emphasis upon industry and commerce. From France came also the Rousseauian cult of

simplicity with its sentimental appreciation of the hardy rustic. The English theoreticians and practitioners of the new husbandry were known from Jethrow Tull to Arthur Young, though the influence of the latter was less than might be supposed. English, and not least Scotch, models of ploughs, seeding machinery, and threshing devices were brought over, where it was attempted to apply them directly, or adapt them to local conditions.

The agitation for agricultural reform, therefore, borrowed from all sides. Its outward form it naturally assumed from the prevailing cultural movement of the age, that of the enlightenment. As the enlightenment was an upper-class phenomenon with a distinct flair for benevolence, it condescended to the humble farmer even while trying to help him. "Thus it is not they [the peasants] who really can improve agriculture, but the wise and the learned must come to their assistance," wrote the Danish economist F. C. Lütken in 1756.⁵⁰ The panacea of the age was education: therefore the farmers must be taught. To the argument of conservatives that education would merely spoil them, J. S. Sneedorff answered:⁵¹

They are probably right, if they mean our tenant peasantry, such as they generally are. At any rate, their circumstances are so miserable that it is easy to believe that a certain degree of stupidity and insensitiveness alone can render their condition supportable and that the happiness of the peasant, if he still enjoys any, would cease as soon as he should begin to think and as soon as he should be deprived of those two powerful consolations, ignorance and brandy.

Freedom, property, and "those general human and civic rights," Sneedorff insisted that the law must guarantee to the peasantry; they must be made secure in society.⁵² "Liberty" was one of the fetish words of the period, widely used and seldom defined; but as far as agricultural reformers at least were concerned, it quickly acquired a very precise connotation, namely freedom from compulsory labor and freedom to move about at will. The term property to them implied approximately what today is meant by individual enterprise: consolidation of scattered strips into single farms, the right to rent, preferably to own, such farms, and the division of the common.

Science, that supreme authority of the enlightenment, was called upon to serve agriculture and did not refuse. The

Upsala professor of chemistry, Johan Gottschalk Wallerius, wrote a famous treatise, *Åkerbrukets kemiska grunder*, 1761, which must be recorded as the beginning of agricultural chemistry. Botanists, such as Linné and Oeder, contributed to the general discussion; academies of science established sections on agriculture; and the whole movement tended toward a more scientific, a more rational system.⁵³ In common with other representatives of the enlightenment, therefore, the agitators for agricultural reform became enemies of tradition. "The peasant thinks," wrote F. C. Lütken, "and would that many a lord did not think likewise, that when he has ploughed and tilled his soil as his father did before him, then there is nothing further to do about it; for to want to go farther than his father, that would be to challenge the economy and the arrangements of God."⁵⁴

The campaign for agricultural reform was carried on by all available means. Since both governments permitted free discussion of the problem, a very considerable literature was published, and journals and societies offered prizes for essays on the solution of various problems; thus *Danmarks og Norges økonomiske magasin* the first year offered prizes for the best suggestions for the cultivation or forestation of the heath in northern Jutland and for drawings of a lighter and more efficient plough. In 1760, it offered a medal for the best answer to the question: "What are the most considerable obstacles to the abolition of common holdings in land, and by what means can they most easily and certainly be overcome, without prejudice to those concerned?" The answers were published in 1761. Of all the contributors only one, Otto D. Lütken, favored retention of the communal system.⁵⁵

As interest in agriculture increased, promotional societies, a form of social action which reached the Scandinavian countries early in the eighteenth century, were organized. The Royal Academy of Science, founded in Sweden in 1739, was divided into classes, one of which was devoted to economics and agriculture; its published *Transactions* were the chief organ for agricultural subjects until 1776. In 1767 the Royal Patriotic Society (*Kungliga patriotiska sällskapet*) was founded, also in Sweden, and from 1776 to 1813 its journals carried the discussion.⁵⁶ The same development took place in Denmark, and

belatedly in Norway. The Royal Danish Agricultural Economic Society (*Det kgl. danske landhusholdningsselskab*), founded in 1769, became the center of the movement, conducting experiments with various types of ploughs, offering premiums for essays and for practical achievements, and conducting a widespread educational activity, extending even to Norway.⁵⁷ The Trondhjem Scientific Society (*Det trondhjemske videnskabselskab*), founded in 1760, was for a time the chief agency for the promotion of Norwegian agriculture; in 1792, the Corresponding Topographical Society of Norway took up the matter; and in 1810 the Association for the Welfare of Norway (*Selskabet for Norges vel*). In the 1790's, there were sufficiently many farmers, usually the wealthier and more capitalistic ones, aroused to the need of improvement, to form provincial societies. To a certain degree, these local societies owed their origin to the recommendations of Thaer, the Prussian agricultural economist.⁵⁸ Quite naturally, they got nearer to the common people than the academic scientific societies, for their members and leaders were known and the results of their experiments did not need to be taken on hearsay.

By no means the least valuable work was done by private individuals: proprietors, officials, and preachers. It was the revolutionary work of certain Holstein proprietors, who by consolidating strips and allocating land in long-term or hereditary leasehold transformed liabilities into assets, which first demonstrated to Danish proprietors the profitable possibilities of reorganizing the rural social structure. One of these Holstein proprietors, Count Stolberg, as manager of the queen-dowager Sophie Magdalene's estate, Hörsholm, made the beginning in Denmark proper (1759-61). Another, Count Bernstorff, set an example on his own estates and did much to promote the movement among Danish proprietors.⁵⁹ Bishop Erik Pontoppidan, editor of *Danmarks og Norges oekonomiske magazin*, in the preface to volume V (1761) declared that much was being quietly and privately done in Denmark. Some proprietors were substituting fixed moderate payments in money for compulsory labor services; others were consolidating strips and a few even selling farms to peasants outright; a few experiments with crop rotation and fodder plants were in progress. This proprietorial activity received a setback when Struensee tried to force the

issue in the early 'seventies, for his regime ended in a reaction against the German elements and a revival of all forms of conservatism.

Similar proprietorial experiments were made in Sweden, and it is interesting to note that the first experimenters seem to have been men with Scotch Jacobite traditions. Linné fell into raptures of enthusiasm, in 1749, when he visited the estate of Barsebäck i Scania, where Major-general Hamilton had compelled the peasants, not only to cultivate his demesne efficiently, but even to apply the same methods on their lands.

Main and secondary ditches were dug to drain away superfluous water; a new arrangement was introduced upon the fields in order that the peasant holdings should not be scattered about in small strips, and in order that the narrow ridges might be evened out into broad and slightly convex areas, for it had been noted how grain would grow well on top of the ridges but very poorly between them. The peasants who resisted this unwonted digging in the fields were ordered, when they reported for work on the lord's estate, to dig ditches about their own fields, and under close inspection, too. On this estate efficient drags, of a kind I had not yet seen in Scania, were used to level the soil so that no hollows should remain. The manure, when I was there, had been spread upon the fields, and the peasants were compelled, quite contrary to custom, to work it into the soil at once lest the strong ocean winds carry it away.⁶⁰

Baron Rutger Mclean, upon falling heir to the Scanian estate Svaneholm, in the 1790's, consolidated the strips into small compact farms and introduced money payments for part of the compulsory service obligations. Observing his success in transforming Svaneholm into a model and profitable enterprise, many other proprietors made similar reforms.⁶¹

The role of the private proprietor was not so considerable in Norway as in the other two countries. But there too, especially in the vicinity of such southeastern cities as Drammen and Oslo, where the merchant princes laid out country estates, there were great proprietors who prided themselves on their English agricultural technology and their English foremen.⁶²

More important than the proprietors to the education of the small farmer were those officials, especially clergymen, who, until far into the nineteenth century, were compensated from the public lands which were allotted to them for cultivation. Their agriculture was conducted on approximately the same

economic basis as that of the common people and their lands were often but little more choice. Recruited usually from the bourgeoisie, fairly well educated, always equipped with sufficiently expensive tastes to make them keen for profit, almost always with some experience of towns and their ways, these persons often became model and experimental farmers. To them can often be traced the growth of local interest in proper drainage, scientific breeding and care of cattle, crop rotation, and above all, the introduction of the potato. The Swedish pastor in a Finland charge, Anders Chydenius, broke new ground, kept a good Spanish breed of sheep, and formed a company of peasants (1761) to lay out a tobacco plantation.⁶³ The Trondhjem bishop, Johan Ernst Gunnerus, became the inspiration of all the practical, scientific, agricultural work of the "potato preachers."

III. PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD THE CAPITALISTIC AGRICULTURAL SYSTEM

But all this agitation could avail nothing, and did avail nothing, until a market was developed for agricultural products. Without markets, profit could not replace mere subsistence as a motive; and without the hope of profit there would be no incentive for the individual to leave the security of the village with its communal system of cultivation, nor to risk the adoption of new methods and new crops, except perhaps the potato, which could be fitted into the village system and which had a direct sustenance value.

Foreign trade in grain and animal products the Scandinavian countries always had. Denmark in the eighteenth century exported steers and horses south through Jutland to Germany and Holland and grain north to Norway. Even in the previous century Danish agriculture had showed capitalistic tendencies, as the lords produced for the foreign markets, as more and more of the land was assembled into large estates, and as prosperity depended increasingly upon international price fluctuations. The tendency toward large grain-producing estates was a movement in pursuit of profits. But it brought profits only to the proprietors, and since prices declined until about 1731, even to them only if they could get labor for little or nothing. The system of compulsory labor, however, resulted merely in very

inefficient labor and in mass poverty of such proportions as to cut into the small margin of the lords' profits. Danish industry could not absorb the rural population driven off the land by enclosure, as English industry did after 1760; consequently the system of large estates broke down, and even the possibility of the lords' profit depended on a self-sustaining rural population. This interdependence led straight to the great reforms of the seventeen eighties and 'nineties. Meanwhile the government did what it could to assure Danish agriculture a market. But such public efforts were largely ineffectual at a period when every country was following the mercantilistic principle of self-supply and when even at home mercantilistic solicitude over cheap food for industrial labor expressed itself in export duties; but nevertheless, the government, hoping to develop a market for Danish agriculture, laid heavy duties on foreign grain and cattle, and between 1735 and 1788 southern Norway was forbidden to import any but Danish grain. The domestic urban market, especially that of Copenhagen, of course counted for something, but, in spite of slowly rising prices after 1730, it became progressively plainer that the old system of agriculture would not allow even the proprietors to profit greatly; whereas under a system of individual initiative both proprietors and peasants could prosper.

Both Sweden and Norway, in the eighteenth century, were importers of foodstuffs. The hope of profit from exports therefore could supply no incentive to agricultural development. In fact, the foreign grain trade was so little developed that when, from time to time, importation was necessary in Sweden, the government itself had to undertake it.⁶¹ In these countries the profit motive could operate only toward the exploitation of the domestic market. But as long as means of transport remained inadequate, as long as governments restricted the internal grain trade by requiring peasants to buy and sell at specified towns, as long as movement of agricultural products was further hampered by internal customs duties, and especially as long as the money-less economy prevailed in the countryside, there could be no exploitation even of the domestic market.⁶⁵ At the opening of the nineteenth century, therefore, the system of production for home consumption remained overwhelmingly predominant.⁶⁶

Breaches were appearing, however, in the wall of that system. The art of distilling brandy from grain had found its way to the Scandinavian countries in the second half of the seventeenth century, and was practised by almost every household. Without stretching the point unduly, it may safely be said that this was mainly due to a desire to convert the grain into an easily transportable and marketable article. The mash was fed to the cattle, almost the only "improvement" in foddering that the eighteenth century can show. Distilling, therefore, came to be viewed as absolutely necessary to agriculture.⁶⁷ Most of the product was no doubt consumed at home, but in time more and more of it was sold; and consequently, when in 1792 the Norwegian peasants were forbidden to distill brandy and that activity was reserved to the towns, intelligent Norwegians protested that the decree was very harmful to agriculture and insisted that the farmer ought to be free to make the most of his crop.⁶⁸ In 1816 the Norwegian *storting* restored the distilling privilege to the rural population in the belief that they must be allowed opportunity to produce a marketable commodity. There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that the brandy trade helped to break down the economic isolation of the individual farmer, whatever deplorable consequences it may otherwise have entailed. By contrast, the royal monopoly on distilling in Sweden, 1775-1788, appears to have had a specially vitalizing effect upon the grain trade of that country. The Crown established a purchasing agency and bought grain directly from the farmer. Unfortunately the agency paid him in brandy. But it paid more for good grain than for poor, and its demand for rye resulted in an increase of rye production at the expense of oats. Reports of provincial governors indicate that when the Crown gave up the distilling business, the peasants came belatedly to appreciate the opportunity it had afforded for sale of grain at steady prices, and that more attentiveness was devoted to agriculture in this period than either before or after.⁶⁹

Another factor which stimulated the grain trade in Sweden, and later probably in Norway, was the system of crown and parish granaries. Taxes were still, in eighteenth century Sweden, paid largely in produce, especially grain, which was stored in special warehouses. From these depositories the state

sold when it needed money, but in the last quarter of the century the formerly occasional function of famine relief became the chief one. To insure against crop failures the king had in 1734 upon resolution of the *riksdag* instructed the provincial governors to encourage the voluntary establishment of parish grain depots. The first circular remaining practically without effect, another was issued in 1750, and in the following decades a great many depots were founded. In 1832, there were 989 depots in 890 different parishes. They were adopted in Norway about 1772, where in 1840 there were 216. Intended at first to be only emergency depots, they soon developed into virtual banks, making loans in grain and taking back interest and principal out of crops. Not infrequently the community could completely replenish the grain supply in the depot with interest payments and still have enough to contribute to poor relief, hire a public physician, or pay the wages of some local official. The depots were managed cooperatively by the members.⁷⁰ Their influence upon the evolution of the Swedish grain trade was, Åmark thinks, less than that of the brandy distilleries, but still considerable. They were never as widely adopted in Norway as in Sweden and were managed by public officials. The Norwegian merchants and the Danish proprietors who engaged in the Norwegian grain trade hated the public granaries, for they functioned as market stabilizers and price depressors; public officials were sensitive to these objections and frequently neglected to keep the depots filled. In both countries they began to decline about 1830, when there was no longer any need for their rudimentary functions, but there were still a few in existence in Sweden in 1865.⁷¹

The internal trade in agricultural products was freed from restrictions and customs at different periods in the three kingdoms. In Norway it occurred in the first half of the eighteenth century.⁷² Gustav III decreed it for part of Sweden in 1775, for all of it in 1780, and sent a copy of the first decree to Turgot.⁷³ In Denmark, a decree dated August 11, 1797, gave the peasants on Zealand permission to purchase calves, lambs, hogs, geese, chickens, ducks, eggs, fish, and butter, and to sell them on the Copenhagen market. A consumption tax was continued on farm products at the gates of the Danish cities until the 1850's, but on April 23, 1845, freedom of internal trade in agricultural

products was declared by extending the principle of the ordinance of 1797 to all provinces and by enlarging the list of commodities.⁷⁴

Meanwhile the general development of industry and commerce swept the trade in agricultural products along. When the use of sugar, coffee, certain iron-wares and textiles spread to the common farmers, they were forced to give their own products in exchange. The gradual substitution of taxes to be paid in money for taxes payable in kind also drove the farmer to market. The European wars from 1792 to 1815 stimulated Scandinavian agriculture as it had never been stimulated before, by increasing the demand for its products, and by increasing prices both through greater demand and through inflation. Although the crisis that followed the wars was severe, it could only retard further development, not wipe out what had been gained.

The development of so active a trade in farm products is explicable under the existing circumstances only in terms of individual enterprise. It was in hope of profit that the first experiments were made in breaking up the so-called manorial system and in consolidating strips into compact individual farms. Increased agricultural production contributed to the expansion of trade, which showed profit, and these visible profits led to further individualization of agricultural enterprise. This statement suffers from brevity and oversimplification, yet it is essentially true. Between 1740 and 1770, roughly speaking, effective public opinion in Denmark and Sweden had concluded that agriculture could thrive only if it were possible to accomplish a veritable social revolution. This revolution would involve five measures, mutually interdependent, or consequent one upon the other: 1. consolidation of strips into single or very few holdings; 2. division of the commons; 3. break-up of the village system; 4. the end of communal cultivation; 5. the regulation by law of the compulsory labor obligations of the tenant to his lord preparatory to their redemption or total abolition. It is well to remember that the transition from village life and open field agriculture to rural capitalistic individualism was no less fraught with emotional reaction, than the now proposed transition from "rugged individualism" to communism, and it has often been said that only a dictatorship,

an enlightened despotism, could have effected the revolution. Yet in Jutland the transformation was achieved earlier than in the Danish islands, and without benefit of absolutism. To be sure, the system of large estates had never there been able to destroy individual ownership to the same extent as in the islands, and because of the poverty of the soil in the heather regions the village community was not everywhere prevalent. Nevertheless, it was a great departure from custom when, in 1760, the peasants on the Grubbesholm estate in the province of Ringkjöbing bought the whole estate, even the church and its tithes, parcelled it out among themselves, and resold a part to reduce costs. Thus was inaugurated a movement which spread to all of Jutland, and left almost no estates untouched. When the great reforms began, in 1784, they found less application in the peninsula than in the islands, for much that they were intended to accomplish had already there been achieved.⁷⁵ Quite probably the same thing would have taken place on the islands too, even without the intervention of the government; at any rate about one fourth of the estates on Funen are said to have been so purchased and parcelled.⁷⁶ But government intervention certainly hastened the transformation.

The first Danish decree aiming at the consolidation of holdings was issued in 1758, and in the ensuing decade various proposals were made by representatives of the enlightenment.⁷⁷ With Struensée, enlightenment and despotism were momentarily united (1770-1772). He made certain promising beginnings, among them the establishment of an agricultural commission of thoroughgoing reformers and the decree of February 20, 1771, ordering that labor obligations be fixed and that disputes be settled by the state. But the ruthless disregard of this German intellectual for all national tradition and for all vested interests, together with his love affair with the queen, aroused to full pitch the Danish national sentiment which had for some time been quietly increasing. In the opinion of Edvard Holm he did the cause of agricultural reform more harm than good,⁷⁸ for he made inevitable the reaction of nationalistic conservatism represented by Ove Høeg Guldberg (1772-1784). Guldberg repealed the Struensée decree of 1771, and actually strengthened the legislation binding the peasant to his master's estate. Nevertheless, so strong was the demand for

reform, that toward the end of his ministry even Guldberg was forced to concede to it. The result was a decree (1781) giving every part owner of village lands the right to have his share in one block regardless of the possible objections of other common owners. Loans to cover initial expenses, such as those of building and moving, were to be granted by the state. This legislation placed Denmark on the threshold of the decisive agricultural reforms of the seventeen eighties and 'nineties.

In Sweden, too, the eighteenth century brought public action favorable to individual agricultural enterprise. The older points of view on the necessity of preserving the size of the individual holding for taxpaying purposes and maintaining the family farm gave way to newer ones arising out of a mercantilistic capitalism and the zeal for an increase of population.⁷⁰ As a matter of fact, population was already increasing more rapidly than the ability of industry to absorb it; consequently the peasants themselves were under the necessity of providing for their children. This could only be done by developing waste land or by subdividing the family farm. Consequently, in 1747, the laws against subdivision were largely repealed. The results were soon apparent in parcels so minute, at least in Dalarne and southwestern Sweden, that toward the close of the century a strong reaction began to appear against this sort of freedom.⁸⁰ The trouble was aggravated, of course, by the widely prevalent strip system. Hans Järta, governor of Dalarne province in 1822, reported that often the property of a single owner, frequently not of a total acreage sufficient to support him, would consist of over a hundred scattered strips.⁸¹

No less in Sweden than in Denmark did the agitation for a better agriculture insist upon the necessity of liberating the individual's initiative by consolidating strips and abolishing communal cultivation. It was one of the cardinal points in the program advanced by Jakob Faggott in 1746. As early as 1757 a decree was issued, enabling the individual villager to have his holdings consolidated into a few parcels (*storskifte*). It was well understood that in a country with as much marshy land as Sweden, drainage systems were a primary necessity which, however, could not be accomplished as long as a single ditch might destroy a whole strip. But the powerful conservatism of the village was usually an effective deterrent against consoli-

dation. That something was achieved, however, is indicated by the report of the governor of Wester-Norrland province. At the *landsting* (the provincial assembly) he had met peasants from all parts of his district, and had suggested various improvements, such as removal of stone from the fields, drainage, and partial consolidation. And between 1764 and 1769, partial consolidation had there actually been undertaken in hundreds of villages. The number of public surveyors had to be considerably increased, and even so they were extremely busy.⁸² Another reform, confined chiefly to Finland and northern Sweden, which the government did its best to promote, was the definition of private and public property (*avvittring*). In the forest regions pioneers had cleared themselves homesteads, established villages, and in so doing had laid out commons that were unreasonably large and often had no known boundary separating them from public lands. When the state now undertook to define those boundaries, it was not with the intention of discouraging settlement, quite the reverse. But since it was inevitable that the villages should claim more land than the state was willing to concede, the delimitation of properties gave rise to no little dissatisfaction.⁸³

The government of Gustav III (1772-1792), in which physiocratic theories were represented by such an able exponent as Liljencrantz, had a clear conception of what Swedish agriculture needed; but, as so often in the case of enlightened despotisms, enlightenment was ahead of the economic development which made fruitful action possible. The *Kammarkollegium*, in 1774, reported a program which if carried out would have advanced Swedish agriculture to the stage reached by Denmark after 1784. But the only result was the continued promotion of partial consolidation and definition of properties and, important enough, freedom for the internal grain trade.⁸⁴

Almost the only public measures undertaken to promote a new agriculture in Norway were certain relaxations of the restrictions upon the right to subdivide family farms (*odel*). A royal decree in 1764 declared that His Majesty would view subdivision favorably, because it would mean better cultivation and a larger population; but the decree carried no specific provisions eliminating the claims of the ranking heir and therefore remained ineffective. A later decree, in 1769, drafted by

the liberal Henrik Stampe, granted the head of the family more freedom to subdivide, but not to sell. This measure too was almost without effect, and the large farms maintained themselves in the southeast and Trondhjem region at the expense of the rapidly growing class of crofters. In the western mountain districts, however, the *odel* system broke down almost completely, but with this development legislation had nothing to do. Meanwhile, the sale of public lands continued, and the Norwegian peasantry cautiously followed the proprietors and officials in the adoption of better methods and implements.⁸⁵

It cannot be said that the agricultural revolution inherent in the rise of the middle class had proceeded far in Denmark before 1784, when the period of the "great agricultural reforms" began, nor in Sweden and Norway before 1800. The great transformation occurred in each country after these dates, and will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. But clarity on what was necessary had been achieved, and the first experiments had been made. Furthermore, middle class ideas on agricultural reform had been accepted by the governments, rendering further legislation certain. The old system had been effectively undermined, and Scandinavian agriculture faced a new era.

CHAPTER III



THE FOUNDING OF A MIDDLE CLASS CULTURE

Let old prejudices be eradicated and let students' minds become as blank slates before they are filled with information,—for if this precaution be not observed they will regard nothing true except what is taught by the sect to which they happen to have attached themselves.¹

I. THE EUROPEAN BACKGROUND

When the seventeenth century drew to a close, the religious ferment, which had disturbed Europe from the days of Luther to the Peace of Westphalia, had subsided and formed a crust. It was the crust of orthodoxy. Religion had become standardized,—not by Pan-European gauges, but by regional and national ones. Identified with small, precariously situated states, the various established religious systems were hedged about with that jealous regard which is the mark of weakness. Insistence upon the use of only official prayerbooks, official hymnaries, official rituals, served to stifle the vigorous individualism that had made the sixteenth century rich in variety. This was especially true of the Lutheran countries; but Catholicism had also been forced to more precise definition of dogma. Only in England and in Holland, where commercial capitalism regarded profit as profit whether made with the orthodox or the heterodox, was there broad tolerance. The general view of life in 1700 differed little from that of the middle ages. To the masses, and even to most of the university men, the earth was still the center of the universe and the object of God's special solicitude; salvation of the soul for a life beyond this still remained the greatest concern of man; the men and the books that dealt with these problems were revered and read more than others. What education there was had been established and continued to be maintained almost solely to furnish safe theologians, and to that end the schools employed, in the Lutheran countries at least, the Latin language and the scho-

lastic method, instruments admirably contrived for purposes of standardizing the academic output. The results of doctrinal standardization were everywhere apparent in protestant countries. Sermons crowded out the more sentimental parts of the ritual; the sermons themselves lacked originality even in structure. The better were likely to be learned theses on abstruse subjects quite beyond the range of the simple parishioners' mind and interests; the poorer were merely pedantic parades of academic paraphernalia. Against this sterility there was bound to be a reaction, even within the churches. It came in the form of pietism, which had its beginnings in Germany, and its counterparts in Scandinavian pietism and English Wesleyanism.

Meanwhile the life of man in Western Europe was becoming more and more worldly. This development reached its maturity in the eighteenth century. The gradual growth of towns, the progressive development of a capitalistic economy accentuated man's reliance upon his own ingenuity. The Commercial Revolution accelerated urbanization tremendously. The remarkable economic and cultural progress of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries demonstrated that the conditions of life on this planet could be improved,—demonstrated it so completely that, indeed, a literature of utopias appeared. The beginning interest in economics and in government indicated a growing absorption with the things of this life.

Science, too, had emancipated itself from the medieval belief in the supernatural and from the limitations of authority. Mathematics, the necessary instrument of the other exact sciences, was developed into a tool of great precision and pliability. Astronomy reduced the earth to a small piece of an immense universe, but at the same time the geographical discoveries greatly enlarged the immediate world of the western European man. This intellectual growth is well reflected in the titles of Kepler's two works, *Mysterium cosmographicum* (1596) and *Physica coelestis* (1609). Astronomy was at first even in his hands a mystery; he left it a science and foreshadowed the natural law, which Newton established in 1666; with Newton the universe took on the appearance of a machine. A few decades earlier, Descartes had already drawn the full philosophical consequences of the trend in this direction. On the basis of the sciences of mathematics and physics, he

advanced the conception of a mechanical universe which quickly penetrated all fields of knowledge. God became the master-mechanic, and religion became only deism. Nature and the natural tended more and more to become the test of truth, whether in the realm of legal and political institutions, social conditions, or religion. The new science had demonstrated that reason, not revelation, was the pathway to the comprehension of nature; the new outlook upon life therefore became rationalistic.

History reveals no sharp break in the intellectual evolution of Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The scientific method was applied in both, though gradually extended to new fields. The rationalistic conception of the universe was more extensively accepted. This continuity was as marked in the Scandinavian countries as in the rest of Europe. Sweden, during the period of her greatness from Gustavus Adolphus to the Treaty of Nystad in 1720, was in constant touch with Germany and France, and from them received impulses which gave to her intellectual life the same general direction as that of Europe. Her trade in timber and iron also carried new ideas. There was no need for Descartes to teach his philosophy during his brief sojourn in Sweden, or gain new adherents. He was invited to come there because of an already existing interest in his thought and work, especially on the part of Queen Christina, and the great man's coming served to spread its fame. From Descartes there is a lineal intellectual succession through Bishop Johan Bilberg to Anders Rydelius to Olov Dalin, the foremost exponent of rationalism in Sweden.² By the close of the seventeenth century, Cartesianism was no longer considered heresy in the universities; the medical profession had been among the first to accept it. The pioneers in the scientific study of law, Grotius (1583-1645) and Pufendorf (1632-1694), both spent several years in Swedish service, the former as ambassador at Paris (1635-1645), the latter as professor at the University of Lund and as royal historiographer. Though Sweden did not, in the seventeenth century, produce any great representatives of the new science, her scholars were aware of what was taking place. Charles XI founded two research institutions, a chemical laboratory headed by the physician Urban Hiärne, and a mechanical laboratory by Christo-

pher Polhem. The cosmopolitan outlook of Sweden was reflected even in the church, where the prevailing orthodoxy was modified somewhat by such men as Bishop Jesper Svedberg (the father of Emanuel Swedenborg), Erik Benzelius, and Hakvin Spegel.

In Denmark also the continuity is apparent. Descartes' friend, Rasmus Bartholin (1625-1698), urged the study of material things and ridiculed scholastic argument.³ His brother, Thomas (1616-1680), contributed the important discovery of the lymphatic glands to the science of anatomy (1683), and his nephew, Caspar Thomson (1655-1788), gave the family name to the *glands of Bartholin*. Ole Römer discovered the speed of light in 1675.⁴ Several of the younger generation of scholars at the close of the seventeenth century were ceasing to perform the academic duty of disputation; the breach with the old method was by no means due entirely to Holberg. The doctrines of a "natural law" as distinguished from divine law, promulgated by Grotius, Pufendorff and Thomasius, began to be taught at the University of Copenhagen at the beginning of the new century by Professor Reitzer, the protector of Holberg, who continued the work, and by Professor Andr. Höjer. Ole Worm, who made important contributions to the natural sciences of botany and medicine, laid the basis for a scientific study of history by stimulating antiquarian researches throughout the Danish realm, and by his attempt to catalog the runic inscriptions.

Only in Norway, where there was no university and no great cultural center, did the eighteenth century represent a sharp breach with the seventeenth.

As in other parts of Europe, so in the Scandinavian countries, the rising culture was of the towns. At first it was predominantly an importation from abroad into the Scandinavian academic centers. But it was inevitable that the growing interest in urban activities represented by mercantilism should quickly domicile this new culture and even give it an indigenous character. The eighteenth century was marked by the progressive accumulation of urban wealth. In Sweden, the technological demands of the iron and mining industries promoted the rapidly growing interest in science.⁵ Therefore it was not primarily the authoritarian upper classes, nor yet the rural

population—still so subject to the uncontrollable accidents of weather —, which inclined to accept the viewpoint of rationalism. It was the bourgeoisie. In the course of their own activities they were forced to apply rational methods, such as accounting; their preoccupations were chiefly the things of this world. Standing as they did at the confluences of commercial currents, their minds were subjected to the impacts of newly discovered facts: new trade routes, new commodities, new islands, newly opened continental interiors, strange cultures, strange laws, strange religions. Their curiosity, powerfully aroused by these new experiences, found in their growing wealth the means of satisfaction. In response to this demand, there arose, first in Holland and England, later everywhere, a plain man's book, suited in price to his purse, in size to his pocket, and in style to his commonplace taste. And written, not in the language of the learned, but in vernacular. Thus more and more the interests of the practical, work-a-day world asserted themselves at the expense of the devotional attitude. Rationalism in Scandinavia did not differ from that of other countries in its utilitarian spirit. Even pietism was as much a religion of practical virtue as a religion of faith.

II. PIETISM

Pietism may be dated from 1675, when Spener published his *Pia desideria*. It spread rapidly in North Germany, and soon found headquarters in Halle, where August Hermann Francke founded his orphanage and where a new university was established. It began in Germany as a reaction against the formalistic Lutheran orthodoxy, which emphasized salvation by faith, and therefore the one and only true doctrine, to the practical exclusion of the good life. As Luther had denounced the interposition of the institutional church between God and man, so Spener and Francke demanded a personal relationship between the individual and his God. They denied that any special sanctity attached to the professionalized clergy, and therefore urged an active participation by laymen in the group study and interpretation of Scripture. They held that the true faith must necessarily improve the moral conduct of the believer, and that the heterodox, even the unbelievers, should be extended sympathy and toleration. Quite naturally the pietists emphasized the two

points upon which they differed most markedly from the orthodox clergy, namely a personal, emotional, religious experience and good works. The founders' sense of balance was often wanting in their successors; consequently pietism soon developed highly revivalistic and even separatistic tendencies.

It was inevitable that the new movement should spread to the Scandinavian countries. Indeed, if pietism had not already appeared in Germany, or if it had not been readily adaptable to Scandinavian religious conditions, a very similar movement might easily have begun indigenously. Orthodoxy in the Northern Lutheran countries was no less formalistic, no less sterile than in Germany. A reaction against it was overdue. In fact it might almost be said to have begun before the influence from Germany appeared. In Sweden, where the clergy occupied a relatively independent position until the Church Ordinance of 1686 extended the Carolinian absolutism also over them, the four decades before 1720 witnessed the activities of such eminently capable men as the two archbishops, Hakvin Spegel and Erik Benzelius Sr., and the Bishop of Skara, Jesper Svedberg.⁶ The latter had under his charge the Swedish congregations in London, Lisbon, and Pennsylvania, and through the reports he received from them he was well aware of the synergistic tendencies in the Reformed churches. His personality was cut from the same cloth as the pietists, a curious combination of mystic and man of action. Mere bigness of faith, *stortron* as he called it, did not suffice for him; he demanded that faith be manifest in good works.⁷ Evidence of an awakening is to be found also in the missionary movement, which had its beginnings in Denmark and Norway before the advent of pietism, though it afterward derived much nourishment therefrom. The most notable of these early missionaries, the Norwegian Hans Egede, apostle to the Greenland Eskimos, was not a pietist.

To an age which still accepted hardship and misery as the wrath of a supernatural being, there was, furthermore, ample reason to assume that God was especially angry. Crop failures and famines were not unusual in Sweden and Norway; Sweden suffered acute crop shortages in 1697, 1705, 1706, 1708, 1709, 1717, and 1718; in Norway, the normal grain scarcity was accentuated by the war, especially from 1709 to 1717. The Great Northern War bled all three countries white; when it

was over, Denmark was on the verge of bankruptcy and suffered a severe commercial depression which also blighted agriculture; Norway had been subjected to the ravages of invasion; Sweden had fought against overwhelming odds and had made enormous sacrifices of men and wealth. Pestilence had also taken its toll; in 1711 and 1712, Asiatic cholera raged with terrible virulence, especially in Copenhagen and Stockholm. The years following the war were made dreadful in large parts of Sweden and southeastern Norway by epidemics of syphilis. And in the first quarter of the eighteenth century hardly a single town of any importance in Denmark and Norway escaped a destructive conflagration. The rich commercial city of Bergen burned in 1702, Viborg in Denmark in 1726, and finally there occurred the catastrophe in Copenhagen, October 20-23, 1728.⁸ The wrath of God weighed heavily upon all people, and adjured them to repentance.

Not only were the psychological prerequisites of a religious revival at hand, but the development of towns had, in the course of the seventeenth century, created the milieu for such a movement as pietism. Just as the cities had been the incubation grounds of dissent in the middle ages in southern and western Europe, and as the English commercial centers had produced puritanism, so pietism was essentially a bourgeois religion. It was in the cities of Scandinavia and among the bourgeoisie that pietism appeared first, and there it exerted its greatest influence. Only afterward did it spread somewhat to the rural districts.

Genuine pietism reached Scandinavia by very natural channels. Its German representatives had direct relations with Swedish and Dano-Norwegian Lutheranism through the Pomeranian provinces and Schleswig-Holstein. After its first mention, in the records of the Stockholm consistory, in 1702, it appears to have succumbed momentarily to the opposition it encountered, and it was only from about 1712 that it began to gain some strength. The Swedish soldiers returning from the Russian prison camps, where many of them had turned to pietism for comfort, spread the doctrine in the rural districts, and in the 1720's it became a large factor in Swedish intellectual life. It reached Copenhagen at about the same time as Stockholm, but made comparatively little headway until after the

war. In Norway a group of pastors with definitely pietistic leanings formed an association, The Pleiades, *Syvstjernene*, and in 1714 issued a strong appeal to the king. Frederick IV was notoriously profligate, and although there was much in pietism that attracted him it was not until the last years of his reign that he became quite converted. With the accession of Christian VI (1730), pietism became completely dominant in Denmark-Norway and remained so until his death (1746); thereafter it quickly declined.

In its manifestations Scandinavian pietism did not differ greatly from that of Germany. It exerted a wholesome influence by emphasizing the importance of good living as well as of faith. It insisted upon a genuine conversion, indicative of a new relationship between the individual and his God. At its best, this conversion would find expression in a quiet happiness and neighborliness, as in the case of the naval chaplain in Stockholm, Erik Tolstadius, of whom that rationalistic man of the world, Karl Gustav Tessin, wrote, "The love of God shone in his eyes."⁹ Very often, however, it developed into pharisaical self-righteousness.

Characteristic of the whole movement was its abjuration and condemnation of even very innocent pleasures, a tendency which in the greater number exhibited itself in a sour-faced somberness, and in an exasperating interference in other peoples' private affairs. Where, as in Denmark and Norway under Christian VI, pietism became quasi-official and it therefore became profitable to be known as a pietist, the grossest hypocrisy developed. The conversion was likely to be a highly ecstatic "penitential struggle." The Danish poet, Johannes Evald, has described the sultry and almost sensuous atmosphere that pervaded the meetings in the *Golden Bull*, his grandmother's Copenhagen restaurant, where his father, the orphanage chaplain, presided (*The Story of Pantakak*). A natural consequence of their doctrine of individual conversion and the universality of the Christian priesthood was their demand of a large authority for the laymen in the affairs of the church and more active participation by laymen in religious meetings. They met therefore in small groups, or conventicles, often at each others' homes. Such meetings were conducted by no fixed ritual and not necessarily under the leadership of a theologically

trained pastor. They naturally became the breeding places of "false doctrine." Of minor doctrinal vagaries the pietists were quite tolerant, since their emphasis was chiefly on the convert's purity of life. Pietism was not at first essentially separatistic, for it did not aim to destroy the existing religious organization; but the appearance of certain sects with such tendencies was inevitable. In Stockholm, in 1731, there emerged a sect which came to be known as Greycoats (*Gråköltar*). They dressed with utmost simplicity in expectation of an immediate last judgment. Only their habit and piety set them apart, but they were subjected to relentless persecution.¹⁰ An almost monastic movement, which practiced free love and communism was that of the Eriksson brothers in Finland. The German, Joh. Cour. Dippel, caused no little commotion in Denmark and Sweden by his half mystic, half rationalistic doctrine. These sectarian movements were far more numerous in Sweden than in Denmark or Norway, but the Herrnhuter sect, founded by Count Zinzendorf (1700-1760), the godson of Spencer, was the strongest in all three countries. They differed from the more ascetic branches of pietism in the stress that they placed upon family life, and in the almost sensual language in which they conducted their devotions. They were more cohesive than pietism in general and far into the nineteenth century their groups continued to exert a benign influence upon morality and to furnish breeding grounds for religious dissenters.¹¹

The orthodox Lutheran clergy fought pietism with all the formidable weapons at their disposition. They denounced the conventicles as secret conclaves in which heterodoxy and separatism would naturally thrive. Owing partly to the extremism of certain offshoots of the movement, partly to the "holy" embraces and kisses with which the pietists often greeted one another, but also in no small degree to sheer malice, rumors of gross sexual immorality were circulated. The perverted and suppressed interest in sex which marked the age is suggested by the uproar that occurred in Drammen, Norway (1743), when the orthodox clergy entered a complaint that at conventicles of the Herrnhuter congregation, "great numbers of both sexes... sit on benches as at comedies, side by side," instead of staidly, as at regular services, the men on one side of the room and the women on the other.¹² Not content to con-

found the pietists with a mass of learned and hair-splitting theological literature, they invoked the power of the law and played upon the monarch's fear of independent movements. Frederick IV forbade conventicles in 1706; that year the Swedish government did the same in the name of Charles XII. In 1726, the Swedish prohibition was made permanent in the notorious *Konventikelplakatet*; in 1741, Christian VI reluctantly issued a similar Conventicle Act for Denmark and Norway, which, however, did not entirely forbid conventicles provided they were reported in advance to the pastor. Both of these anti-conventicle laws were used far into the nineteenth century to suppress religious dissent. Even these prohibitions fell short of the wishes of the orthodox clergy, for their enforcement depended largely upon the attitude of the local pastor, who might be a pietist, and upon the monarch. In 1723, the chamber of the clergy in the Swedish *riksdag* proposed a far more drastic measure, which included penalties for the printing and selling of pietistic literature, the establishment of inquisitorial commissions, the submission of every prospective traveller to a theological examination, and the rigorous suppression of all non-orthodox worship, especially in conventicles and private assemblages.¹³ In various ways the leaders of the pietists were discovered and made uncomfortable; but the governments did not go to the lengths demanded by the clergy. The governments, indeed, were inclined to view with some satisfaction that the established clergy were placed on the defensive; the Scandinavian conventicle legislation was not directed solely against private devotional meetings, it also enjoined the pastors to so conduct their offices that such meetings should not be considered necessary.¹⁴

Since in Sweden the clergy constituted a separate chamber in the *riksdag*, they could give loud expression to their fears and hatreds. Their political solidarity was probably also responsible for the greater number of persecutions there than in Denmark and Norway. Frederick IV (1699-1730) was the antithesis of the pietistic ideal man, and in the earlier part of his reign he struck hard at all sectarianism. Nevertheless there was much in the new movement that appealed to him, particularly its missionary fervor, its zeal for the improvement of education, and its practical charity. When he needed missionaries for the first

Protestant mission in India, in the Danish colony of Tranquebar, he sought them in the pietistic center of Halle, and when he founded the College of Missions (1714), he placed at its head a man with definitely pietistic leanings, namely Johan Georg Holstein. His own great contribution to the advancement of education, the establishment of elementary schools on his Danish estates, was not inspired primarily by pietism, but he sympathized strongly with the educational demands advanced by the Norwegian group of pietistic pastors, the *Pleiades*. His orphanage, founded at Copenhagen in 1727, was modelled after Francke's famous institution in Halle. In his old age he became a full convert, and then promulgated the Sabbath Ordinance of 1730, a measure of unexampled severity.¹⁵ The next king, Christian VI, was a fanatical pietist, in whose reign (1730-1746) joy and laughter well-nigh disappeared from the realm. His queen, Sophie Magdalena, was a melancholy spirit. Pietism now became so completely dominant that Frederick the Great declared that, whereas under Frederick IV Denmark had usurped Schleswig, the conquest of Heaven itself was being attempted under Christian VI.¹⁶ The Sabbath Ordinance of 1735 forbade innocent pleasures and fixed brutal punishments that proved very difficult to enforce. The court took on a somber tone, theatres were closed, and a commission was appointed to look into the state of church discipline. Nevertheless this fanatical king was still an absolute monarch; therefore when Count Zinzendorff himself came to Copenhagen in 1731, and created turmoil between the orthodox pastors and the pietists by his preaching of works rather than faith, Christian VI was sorely torn between his religious leanings and his conviction that order and discipline were necessary in church and state. Generally speaking, his reign was marked by a distinct favoritism toward men of pietistic stamp but opposition to all separatistic tendencies. The orthodox clergy were therefore able to hold their own, but only by compromising. The appearance of the more extreme forms of pietism, especially Herrnhutism and Dippelism, forced the orthodox to defend their positions; they even had the satisfaction then of seeing many of the more moderate pietists return to the orthodox fold.¹⁷

The results of pietism upon Scandinavian culture have often been exaggerated. It did not completely, or even fundamen-

tally, alter the currents of life. Nor was its influence wholly beneficent. Furthermore, pietism was not something entirely by itself; it developed and made its contribution as a function of a growing society.

Upon the form and spirit of religion, pietism exerted a considerable influence. The conflict with the orthodox clergy expressed itself in such a flood of controversial literature as had not been seen since the Reformation. A mass of new devotional writings also appeared, consisting chiefly of the translated works of Augustine, Josephus, Tauber, Thomas à Kempis, many German authors from Luther down, and a few French. Perhaps the most important pietistic literary contribution in Denmark-Norway was Pontoppidan's *Explanation* of Lutheran doctrine in the form of questions and answers. In 1738 it was made the official textbook in religious instruction, and as such it became the basis of the popular religious revivals of a later date. The pietists did not improve the literary style of religious writing, however; in fact they fell far short of the best of the Reformation period. They almost equalled the orthodox clergy in vituperation and often expressed their emotionalism in snivelling sentimentality. In the matter of sermonology, there was some improvement in the direction of brevity, directness, and sincerity. A letter from Christian VI to the Copenhagen municipal authorities commanded enforcement of his decree establishing fines of from two to ten *riksdaler* for pastors who preached longer than one hour. He enjoined upon the church wardens that they should keep time on the pastors, and either collect the fines or pay them themselves.¹⁸

In their writing, in their preaching, and in the matter of organization, the pietists subordinated everything to reaching the individual. This democratization of religion was their greatest contribution; but therein they were merely fulfilling the pervading spirit of the age,—that of bourgeois individualism. In their conventicles the shipping clerk was as well worth saving as the Duke of Holstein, the woman as well as the man; therefore high and low, men and women, met and sat together and exercised such influence as they might by virtue of superior personality. This, at least, was their ideal. Because the heathen also had souls, missionary work was important; because the heathen had individual souls, Thomas

von Westen, the Norwegian missionary to the Lapps, discarded the preaching technique and individualized the mission work;¹⁹ and because pietists were individually zealous, missionaries were more numerous. Bibles and devotional books were published in small format to fit the hand of the busy individual; the Norwegian group of the *Pleiades* successfully petitioned to have the price of Bibles reduced from ten *riksdaler* to one and in Denmark endowed foundations were established to distribute Bibles.²⁰

Owing partly to the fact that in all three countries many pastors subscribed to the more moderate forms of pietism, partly also to the fact that the state churches were placed on the defensive, they were compelled to partially correct the worst abuses. But complaints against the official clergy for extortion and lax morals continued far into the nineteenth century.²¹ One thing pietism most certainly did not mean to do, whatever the results of its actual individualism may have been, namely reduce the belief in the supernatural. At most it can only be said that "The pietists' conception of the Devil and his game was not essentially different from that of the 17th century, but that they [were] free of the fear which produced the witchcraft persecutions."²² On the other hand, the pietists waged a war of extermination against the folk-amusements of the peasantry, —their music, dancing, story-telling, and festivals. It was this narrowly biblical outlook and a primitive ecstatic religiosity, coupled with what was too often a mere sham of goodness, which caused Kristian Elster, Jr., to exclaim that it was no pietistic revival which the Norwegian community required, but enlightenment of the type represented by rationalism.²³ That there was a considerable revival of religious interest in all three countries, in the cities especially, is undeniable; but whether it was of such a type as to constitute intellectual progress is a controversial question.

The very real contributions of pietism to the cause of education will be discussed in another connection.²⁴ Upon secular literature and art its influence was almost always adverse. The promising beginning made by the theater in Copenhagen in the 1720's ended abruptly, for the righteous man was to take pleasure only in his salvation. Only by emphasizing the individual's conduct and relationship to his God, and thus indi-

rectly deepening the conception of psychological variations, did pietism render any positive contribution to art. In its warfare upon ancient folk-ways, customs and games, it represented the forces inherent in an age of change, but the superstitions that it sometimes set up in place of the ones it endeavored to eradicate represented no great improvement. It was something to break down the popular confidence in gross magical cures, but a modern mind finds it difficult to distinguish between them and the panacea on which the Halle pietist physician, C. F. Richter, became wealthy (tincture of gold), or the claim of the Copenhagen doctor, Werner Boyesen, that he was "by the grace of God endowed with the greatest talents for the healing of mankind."²⁵ It must be admitted, however, that there were not many such cases. That the first half of the eighteenth century witnessed a considerable improvement in the moral tone of the bourgeoisie, especially in Copenhagen, is undeniable; likewise that pietism was one of the contributory factors. Pietism did frown upon the use of coarse language; it did denounce overeating and the use of strong drink; and it did, with its democratic assemblies, counteract the disgusting hankering for artificial position and title. But in the advocacy of these tradesman's virtues it had its best ally in the tradesman's increased opportunities for profit, which made those virtues seem sensible.²⁶

Scandinavian pietism was strong enough to condition subsequent intellectual currents. It had set its roots so deeply that even after it had ceased to be dominant its influence was constantly sensible. Throughout the whole rationalistic era, otherwise marked by science rather than emotion, pietism kept the lamp of sentimentalism quietly burning; and when romanticism about 1800 won its victory over the enlightenment both its secular and religious emotionalism were in part but natural projections of pietism. Swedish literature in the latter half of the eighteenth century is marked by many pietistic influences, and many of the Danish romanticists after 1800 had had direct contact with pietism.²⁷ In no small measure, too, pietism helped to prepare the way for the enlightenment. The period of its ascendancy in Denmark and Norway under Christian VI created a condition against which rationalism was almost a necessary revolt.²⁸ When Frederick V ascended the throne in

1746 there was a sigh of relief that is still audible in the records; the cloak of gloom and hypocrisy was shed, the joy of life began again. Nevertheless, the importance which pietism placed upon life in this world was only exceeded by the utilitarianism of the enlightenment. Another common feature was strong individualism. Herein, of course, they revealed their common determinant, bourgeois culture. In the field of medicine, pietism inclined strongly toward natural remedies: the drinking of water, the use of simple wholesome food, exercise, in certain cases surgery.²⁹ This was another affinity with the Age of Reason.

III. PIONEERS OF THE NEW THOUGHT

Hard upon the heels of pietism there arose in Scandinavia the first representatives of modern thought, —first, not in the sense that they had no precursors, but first in the sense that with them rationalism began to run as a strong stream. The continuity of the intellectual current from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century has already been emphasized. With Ludvig Holberg in Denmark and Norway and with Olov Dalin in Sweden that current enters a new topography; it broadens and forms a lake; its waters mount so high and remain so long as to mark forever that particular historical scene.

Ludvig Holberg (1684-1749) did not, as has sometimes been implied, come wholly unheralded. Denmark was by no means in the forefront of European scientific activity at the close of the seventeenth century, but neither was she entirely on the side.³⁰ Such contributions as were made to the promotion of science had little effect, however, upon philosophy. There were no attempts to formulate any general systems on the basis of the new discoveries; not even Descartes was seriously studied. And no man before Holberg had thoroughly assimilated the advanced thought of the age. In another sense, also, Holberg marks a cultural transition. He was the first of that line of thinkers which Andersen calls neo-humanists. The humanism of the North European renaissance, essentially Erasmian in character, was early split by the reformation, and hence two forms are discernible in Denmark and Norway after 1536: The Erasmian, liberal, cosmopolitan, non-nationalistic humanism,

disputations in Leipzig. After a few years of academic drudgery in Copenhagen, he travelled in France and in Italy, 1714-1716. In Paris he read Bayle, as everyone else there was doing. After two years of the greatest difficulty in Copenhagen, he was made *professor of metaphysics at the university*. This appointment set him free, at last, from economic difficulties, but it made a tragicomic impression upon him that he should be saved by metaphysics, a subject which he thoroughly despised.³²

When at last Holberg attained the rank and the salary of a regular professor, he was thirty-three years old. He had endured only as much of the barren scholastic routine at the University of Copenhagen as was necessary to satisfy the minimum for an academic career. Always a keen observer, his youth in the realistic, work-a-day atmosphere of Bergen and his intimate acquaintance with the great commercial countries of Europe, especially England, Holland, and France, had filled him with an unequalled sense for practical, constructive work. He had discovered on his travels that a culture as genuine as the Greek and the Roman could be built up on the basis of such work. In fact, it was plain to him that true culture could be had on no other basis; for a people which was ashamed of itself and its work could only live in sham and unreality, the very antithesis of culture. Falster, the last of the Erasmian humanists in Denmark, denounced as savagely as Holberg the cheap imitations in Danish civilization; but where Falster urged a return to the ideals of the classical age, Holberg, the first of the neo-humanists, demonstrated the dignity of present-day life. It was this work which Holberg was now enabled to begin. When he began it the life of all classes, but least that of the peasantry, was marked by pretensions, affectations and hypocrisy. The clergy made a formalistic orthodoxy pass for intelligence and sincerity; the schools benumbed the minds of students and teachers with a frigid insistence upon Latin syntax and hopelessly obsolete methodology; paternalistic absolutism had connived at an excessive stratification of society which made it difficult to advance from one level to another without practicing sycophancy. Each grade placed an almost adolescent emphasis upon its clothes and badges, and symbols were everywhere more respected than the achievements that they were supposed to represent.

In sharp contrast to this falsity stood the culture of England, Holland and France which was based upon the realities of science and economic life. On his travels, Holberg had become acquainted with the writing of the naturalistic legal theorists, Grotius, Pufendorff, and Thomasius, and one of his earliest, though least significant works, was based on them.³³ Of the English philosophers, he was attracted to Hobbes, chiefly on account of his bold naturalism and his unpedantic method. Locke, too, was of very great importance to his intellectual development. There are passages in Holberg's writings that are almost paraphrased from Locke.³⁴ By his own testimony Holberg read the English deistic writers, and he was charmed by Addison's and Steele's *Spectator*. Of contemporary French thought, that of Pierre Bayle probably had the earliest and the greatest effect upon him, but he was well informed on the work of others, especially Montesquieu and Montaigne. Curiously enough, Voltaire did not arouse in him any great interest or admiration. Neither Leibnitz, nor Spinoza, had any direct influence upon him.³⁵ But Holberg was far too independent a thinker to be dominated by the ideas of any man. He was in typical accord with his age, however, in preferring literature of a didactic, moralizing nature; therefore he ranked Pope with Milton, even with Homer and Vergil. Daniel Defoe he also appreciated, but especially Swift.

His writing before *Peder Paars* (1719) had dealt with conventional historical and legal subjects. With *Peder Paars* his literary and reforming career properly began, and the time was auspicious. The war was over, people were in a mood for satire and comedy; pietism was not yet dominant; Holberg's improved economic situation had freed his spirit. During the long and often bitter years of his preparation he had laid up a store of things that he wished to say to the Danish people, such things as a widely travelled, realistic man of the world would naturally wish to say. He deliberately set out to burlesque the Danes and their culture, sparing their sensibilities only by antedating his descriptions a century and placing the action on a small Danish island in the Kattegat, Anholt. At the very beginning, the chronicler, Hans Mickelsen, carefully explains that he is not born a Dane, but a Norwegian. Peder Paars undertakes a comically short journey in Danish waters,

on which he meets with strange adventures on the island of Anholt. His chronicler relates how he was shipwrecked there, and then describes the conditions and the culture that he found. Holberg transplants almost every phase of Danish life to the island, and portrays their flaws with a satire that is sometimes viciously mordant, sometimes hilariously funny. In the mirror of Anholt, Holberg revealed the grossness and immorality of the lower classes, the ignorance and venalities of the clergy, the ridiculous pomposity of the bureaucracy, and the silly pretensions of the bourgeoisie; and with a very special venom he scored the precious piffle of Latin disputations at the university. It was a ludicrously small and stagnant society that Holberg described, and a ludicrously pompous self-esteem. The poem caused a sensation. Some who felt themselves accurately described were furious and charged Holberg with deliberate malice; others joined the laughter, imagining, perhaps, that the satire was more at others' expense than at their own.³⁶ The country gasped at the bold young author, recently appointed university professor, who thus tore the veil from the lying life of Denmark. It was probably only the good sense of Frederick IV, who at least had lived and loved openly if not conventionally, which saved Holberg from a prison sentence for libel.

It is impossible to describe adequately even the more important of Holberg's writings. A brief summary will have to suffice. In 1720, when delegated to write the university program for the year, he grandly and perhaps rashly branded the objectives of the institution as obsolete. His program was suppressed. Then he scandalized his colleagues by writing comedies for the recently opened Danish theatre. The comedies of Molière had been played in Copenhagen from time to time since 1686 by a French troupe under René Magnon de Montaigu, whose father was a friend of the great playwright. In 1722 de Montaigu and other actors, both French and German, began to present plays in the Danish language at a small theatre in Lille Grønnegade; it was for this group that Holberg wrote. His autobiography does not mention his interest in drama when journeying abroad, but he probably enjoyed the theatre in France and Italy. He knew and appreciated Molière, Corneille, Racine, and Lafontaine; indeed Holberg has been called the Northern Molière.³⁷ His first play was performed in 1722;

and within six years he had written no less than twenty-one. Then the theatre was closed, and for nineteen years pietism prevented a re-opening. The six plays written after 1747 lacked the freshness and spontaneity of the earlier ones. In each comedy Holberg singled out some one profession, —for example, the military in *Jacob von Tyboe*, the academic in *Erasmus Montanus*, the peasantry in *Jeppe paa Bjerget*—, burlesqued its customs, standards, and pretensions in characters which seem alive even today, and which enraged that profession but amused everyone else. The result was what Holberg had hoped for: in all Scandinavia there was a re-evaluation of work and life, a re-assessment in the sober and realistic spirit of business. If it be true that education is a function rather than a cause of social revolution, then Holberg's comedies were truly educational. In the interval between the production of the comedies, Holberg busied himself with the writing of history. Here, too, he began a new era, proving himself the pioneer of the enlightenment by what he selected for treatment and by what he omitted, as well as by his demand that sources be treated critically. This demand he did not, however, adequately fulfill himself: he wrote too much.

In 1741, Holberg published another satire on Dano-Norwegian and European civilization, *Niels Klims underjordiske reise* (*The Subterranean Journey of Niels Klim*). Anticipating that the book would be condemned by the pietistic clergy at home, he wrote it in Latin, which was still the language of the learned world, and had it published in Leipzig. It was quickly translated into Danish, however, and produced precisely the storm that Holberg had foreseen. But its success abroad, together with the fact that the author's position at home was far less assailable than at the time he wrote *Peder Paars*, enabled him to weather it successfully. Niels Klim, a church warden (*klokker*) in Bergen, falls through a cave, passes through the crust of the earth, finds a whole solar system revolving within the terrestrial globe, and finally lands on the planet, Nazar. There he journeys from one realm to another and describes their religions, governments, and societies. The plan of *Niels Klim* owes much to such books as Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. Holberg is less savage than Swift in his

strictures upon contemporary society, though there are vitriolic passages; at times he despaired of enlightened reform, but his personality and the *Zeitgeist* drove him to promote it. Vilhelm Andersen has well said that *Niels Klim* is kin psychologically, not to the fictitious travels from Lucian to Swift, but to Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*, for in large measure it is a psychological autobiography.³⁸ Here Holberg stands, not at the end, but at the full maturity of his career, revealing something of his inner development and his judgment of society. With very little he was wholly satisfied, only perhaps with absolutism; yet his criticisms and condemnations probably articulated faithfully the contemporary middle class attitudes.

Any study of Holberg will rank him as the first thoroughly modern Scandinavian philosopher. His writings were not primarily philosophical, except for his *Epigrams* and *Epistles*, nor did he consider himself a philosopher. He occupied the chair of metaphysics at the university for two years, but regarded its duties so lightly that he confided in his memoirs: "I have often thought of spending a few days on the study of these matters, but the Lord has never vouchsafed me the time for it."³⁹ Nevertheless, there is evidence of a very definite philosophy of empiricism in practically all that he wrote. He openly advocated the doctrine that man knows only what he learns through his senses. This conviction compelled him to be an individualist, made him, indeed, the first representative of what Anathon Aall calls the Dano-Norwegian philosophy of individualism,⁴⁰ which reappears distinctly in Søren Kierkegaard, Georg Brandes, and Henrik Ibsen, to mention only the greater names. Nietzsche belongs to the same school. All matters resolved themselves for Holberg into individual responsibilities; the dicta of the church councils meant nothing to him. For that reason, he declared, the individual should "have only provisional opinions, whereby he should keep one door always open for a willingness to learn, for instruction, and for the truth that may follow."⁴¹ Holberg admired in Socrates his well balanced sense of the individual's own obligation to learn the truth, as well as his splendid equanimity. Defining study as the quest for truth, Holberg held it justified apart from any practical purpose. "The reason for my studying is the studying itself, I study in order to study."⁴² Indeed, in later

life even special purposes of reform came to seem ridiculous, and he ascribed them to the operation of individual physiological functions, much as the behaviorists do.⁴³ How far he went in his conviction that psychology is individualized by physiology, may be realized from the passage in *Niels Klim* relating that in the subterranean state of *Potu* criminals were subjected to blood tests; if the tests showed any physical irregularity, the accused was acquitted and given medical treatment,—if not, malice aforethought was assumed, and punishment followed.⁴⁴

His treatment of religion was gingerly. Students of his work have been unable to find much evidence of what he sincerely believed. He certainly conformed outwardly to Lutheran orthodoxy, spoke of Luther with great respect, and denounced Catholicism in the conventional manner. But as far as possible he avoided all reference to religion; especially to controversial subjects, and brought his *Church History*⁴⁵ to a close before the reformation began. Jesus he mentioned even less frequently than Luther, and he allowed no clergymen to appear in his comedies. The truth is that Holberg was a rationalist,—by no means so radical as rationalists later became, but with very much the same religion as Locke. He was a humanist and a deist, whose only dogma was that man must not permit himself to speculate upon the nature of God lest he attribute to Him some degrading characteristic.⁴⁶ But an open avowal of so great an emancipation of mind would not have been healthy in Denmark, and Holberg did not court martyrdom. To orthodoxy he therefore rendered lip-service; while admitting that he had read Toland, Tindal, Collins, Whoolstone, *The Moral Philosopher*, and other such works, he declares that the doubts which they caused were allayed by other writers. Then follows a passage, which somewhat earlier in his career would have been dangerous to write:

Heresy which is the result of investigation is more pardonable than orthodoxy without investigation, for he, who believes correctly without having made any study and without having had any doubt, believes only by accident. . . . It is obvious from this how unjust we are when we denounce troubled seekers of the truth, that is, such persons as endeavor by comparison of good and evil books to fathom the truth, for investigation is the longing for comprehension, and its object is the discovery of truth. Inasmuch as reason moves from what we have grasped to

that which we have not grasped, as Cicero says, I do not understand how it can be, that most people prefer to err and stubbornly defend the particular notions with which they have fallen in love, rather than subject such matters to study in order to make sure which can stand. Convinced of this I do not apologize for reading books which attack religion . . .⁴⁷

The long faces of the pietists and the long sermons of the orthodox pastors Holberg detested. Ordinarily he avoided open conflicts on religious issues, but as student assistant to a pastor in Voss (Norway), whose sons he tutored, he preached fifteen-minute sermons,—which delighted the peasants and shocked the pastor.⁴⁸ And the pietists obtruded themselves so assertively upon his modest intellectual precincts that he instinctively lashed out at them in scorn. It was not, however, Holberg's frontal attacks that influenced the religious development of his countries; he was far more significant as the representative of a modern secular ideal which almost ignored religion. He did not, like Voltaire, demand that society *écraser l'infame*; he simply disregarded it, but with enough kindness to permit even so pious a man as Grundtvig⁴⁹ to judge him less harshly than Voltaire.⁵⁰

The processes of education Ludvig Holberg criticized scathingly. They seemed to him to have no relation to the facts of life. He was no enemy of the Latin language, nor did he depreciate the value of training in the forms of expression. But he despised the empty, wordy learning of his age. *Niels Klim* found that in Potu disputants were kept for public amusement, like game-cocks, and doctors of philosophy were there called *Madiks*, the English equivalent of which is *worms*. In Potu no one could become a professor who had not held some practical position.⁵¹ Holberg himself was a canny, competent man of affairs. He acquired a handsome fortune from the sale of his books, and as business manager of the University of Copenhagen he administered its extensive estates. The genuine humanism of Erasmus, which emphasized content as well as form, Holberg esteemed highly.⁵² The objects of true education he held to be the removal of prejudice and the promotion of useful citizenship.⁵³

It was frequently fortunate for Holberg that his political philosophy, at least, was entirely orthodox. He staunchly

upheld the absolutism of the king. Very early in his career he accepted the social contract theory but in applying it he followed Hobbes rather than Locke. His political ideal was an enlightened despotism; Peter the Great was one of his heroes and he lived long enough to see some of the work of Frederick the Great. In his utopian state, Potu, political innovators made their suggestions knowing that if they proved unwise the innovators would suffer death.⁵¹ Nevertheless, Holberg was discriminating even in his friendship for despots. With Frederick IV and Frederick V he was on good terms, but there was no love lost between him and the pietistic Christian VI. And instead of the nauseating eulogies that were customary upon the deaths of the Dano-Norwegian kings, he made the Potuans institute a solemn investigation into the conduct of the past reign,⁵² which formed the basis of official epitaphs.

In two other respects Holberg demonstrated his emancipation from the conventional viewpoints and his identity with the enlightenment. His views regarding the position of woman in society were advanced and he was cosmopolitan rather than narrowly nationalistic. His respect for the individual personality and his freedom from prejudice enabled him to appreciate ability in either sex. History taught him that women might be successful rulers; talent ought therefore to be the only key to public office.⁵⁶ In Potu, he placed a woman on the judge's bench.⁵⁷ Nationalistic Norwegian historians have done their best to prove that Holberg was a patriotic son of that country.⁵⁸ Actually, however, he considered Denmark and Norway a unit, and in training and outlook was far more European than nationalistic.⁵⁹

It is difficult to evaluate what Holberg meant to his contemporaries and to succeeding generations. He opened the door wide to the enlightenment. The emancipation of mind which he won for himself was thereafter possible for others and even inevitable. He gave the Danish stage a strongly didactic character that it has retained until today. But his literary forms and styles very few Danish writers have imitated. The enlightenment came so rapidly in Denmark that Holberg in his old age recoiled from its extremism and lost standing with its younger representatives. The romanticists could not, of course, appreciate him. Not until the last quarter of the nine-

teenth century did a generation of thinkers and writers appear which was able to sympathetically understand his realism, his individualism, and his mocking laughter. He was the precursor of Georg Brandes and Henrik Ibsen, although they lacked his genial disposition. Even though his followers in the eighteenth century soon passed him by, his influence was enormous. The purifying effect of his work and the movement he represented is indicated in the contrast between the egregious vanity of the dedicatory prefaces in many books written at the beginning of the eighteenth century and the honest, sincere, thoroughly sober self-appraisal of F. S. Sneedorff in its last decade.⁶⁰ In Norway, and even in Sweden, many of his books became household classics, more popular even than in Denmark. No less than fifty-three Swedish editions of *Jeppe paa Bjerget* have been found, and there have probably been many more.⁶¹

What Holberg did for the intellectual life of Denmark-Norway, Olof Dalin (1708-1783) is sometimes said to have done for that of Sweden. There, however, the genuine theological-Aristotelian tradition was already breaking. This was perhaps most especially due to the professor and bishop of Lund, Andreas Rydelius (1671-1738), and his influential teaching and writing. It has been shown already⁶² that Rydelius was in the line of intellectual succession from Descartes, and that Sweden, being a great power, was in the seventeenth century much more cosmopolitan in outlook than Denmark-Norway. Many cultural streams had reached Sweden by 1720; the French was the strongest—quite naturally on account of the French alliance—; Sir Francis Bacon and other English names were well known, but English empiricism had not yet become the force which Dalin and his group made it. In two important respects, however, Rydelius prepared the way. His insistence on the practical foreshadowed the utilitarian spirit of the eighteenth century; and, after making obeisance to Lutheran orthodoxy, "he used his reason in an entirely worldly manner, even without the professional spirit of the learned gild. Pedantic haughtiness and hair-splitting Rydelius harshly condemned."⁶³ Boldly and ably he criticized the systems of Spinoza, Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke, and others. Frankly admitting the insolubility of certain problems, such as freedom of will, and keenly dis-

liking exaggerated mysticism, he took a middle ground which appealed to many intellectuals and which probably helped to prevent Swedish rationalism from developing radical extremes.⁶¹

Dalin and the Swedish enlightenment had another interesting precursor in Christopher Polhem (1661-1751), the greatest of the early Swedish applied scientists. He wrote little for publication, and he was probably more radical than his writings. The Mosaic doctrine of creation he discarded for a theory that the earth was once a sun which in the course of many hundreds of thousands of years had become what it now is. He criticized the statement in Genesis that there was morning and evening on the first day, and denied that the earth had been created of nothing. He had a somewhat fantastic molecular theory regarding the composition of matter, and had no faith whatever in any immaterial spirit world. Polhem accepted the Cartesian mechanistic conception of the universe, except in certain details which might be corrected by experiment. His brilliant mind and dominating personality strongly influenced his younger contemporaries.⁶⁵

There was no lack of native intellectual vigor in the first decades of the new century. To its further fruitful development several factors contributed. Although the Great Northern War itself was no stimulus, its outcome had important consequences. The loss of most of the Baltic provinces turned Swedish energies toward the quest of greatness in peaceful pursuits. Furthermore, the royal despotism of the Carolinians came to an abrupt end; the limited monarchy was restored, and the system of representative estates offered to all social classes, especially the nobility, the clergy, and the bourgeoisie, a wide field of activity. And the serious problem of economic reconstruction, together with this sense of responsibility, dictated a realistic approach which was the best possible preparation for the enlightenment. The successful reconstruction under the wise leadership of Count Arvid Horn furthermore provided a sound economic basis for a more advanced culture.

Olof Dalin was the son of a clergyman in the province of Halland, on the North Sea coast of Sweden, a region dominated by the rapidly growing commerce of Gothenburg, which of all Swedish cities most nearly resembled Holberg's Bergen. At

the University of Lund he enjoyed the personal tutelage and friendship of Andreas Rydelius, and thereafter in Stockholm quickly gained admission to the most cultured circles. His pleasing personality and the sensational enthusiasm aroused by his early anonymous writings opened up the brightest prospects for a literary career.⁶⁶ During his early twenties he had read and assimilated a great deal of the contemporary literature of France and England, and at the age of twenty-three he began publishing a journal in the style of Addison's and Steele's *Spectator*. Even earlier he had aroused widespread discussion by a satire on the clergy, and a reward of six thousand *daler* in copper was offered the author when he should reveal his identity. From the first, therefore, Olof Dalin was a product of those social forces which in England developed the new bourgeois literature of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Dalin's journal, *Then Swänska Argus* (*The Swedish Argus*), began to appear in 1732. It closely resembled the English *Spectator* in form and style, and immediately attracted the most favorable attention. Its nimble humor, its popular moralizing tendency, its penchant for the topics uppermost in the average man's mind, the brilliance of its literary style, all combined to arouse an unprecedented interest, which reflected itself in a rapidly growing list of subscribers and in a resolution by the *riksdag* to the effect that when its author should discard his anonymity he should be granted some public office. For two years the cultured people of Sweden looked forward to every new number as to a feast, and mourned when, at the end of 1734, publication ceased.⁶⁷ There had been an earlier, but unsuccessful attempt by one of Dalin's friends, Carl Carleson, in 1730-1731, to introduce the *Spectator* style in Sweden. Now Dalin put his own hand to the task. He dealt with all manner of subjects; in one number he was the staid moralizer, in the next he gaily satirized some institution or social class. He had learned much from Jonathan Swift, and though the *Argus* showed less originality than his contemporaries gave him credit for, he began even here to give evidence of the independence that marked his later production. From the same points of view as Ludvig Holberg, but with rather less of Holberg's intellectual incisiveness, he performed much the same work as his

Danish contemporary. Each was the Voltaire of his country. Dalin had two special antipathies, religious extremism, whether of orthodoxy or of pietism, and pedantic linguistic education. These and other social foibles he lampooned mercilessly, to the immense delight of the younger generation, and so cleverly that even today the reader wonders whether he was of serious purpose or merely wished to amuse.⁶⁸ Classic is his description of one of the fictitious company whom the author of *Argus* introduces as its sponsors. Hiernbrott (Brain-wracker), son of a peasant, had been sent to the university to study theology, "for peasants have ambition, too, yes, even common people consider it degrading to learn a trade, much more so to plough. The Swedes all wish to be gentlemen." When he had studied until in his own estimation he could learn no more, he remained at the university "to illuminate Parnassus." After ten years he concluded to enter the service of the Crown, but discovered to his chagrin that his academic learning made him the laughing stock of that practical profession. Thereupon he

vowed to the Lord, that if he should ever be able to get a clear head and an independent reason, he would never think of learning anything that could not be applied, or with which he would be unable to serve himself or his neighbor. In this, fortunately, he has succeeded, so that he now endeavors to make the most abstruse matters, subjects which the learned profession strive to make incomprehensible, so clear that they can be understood even by women. In theology he is not content to be merely a dogmatist and a theoretician, but also a practitioner. Application and practice he considers inseparable from true science, therefore I hold this man in special esteem.⁶⁹

The eighteenth century urban culture of practical work speaks through these lines.

With *Argus* rationalism breaks the shell in Sweden. Dalin was its first literary representative, and for two decades dominated the Swedish world of letters. He rose in favor at the court and was appointed tutor to the Crown Prince, later Gustav III. In 1743 he was requested by the Estates to write the history of Sweden and then produced *Svea Rikes Historia* (*History of the Swedish Kingdom*), a work which marked a new era in Swedish historiography. All his life he ridiculed the churchmen, the learned tribe, and the red tape of administration. But with all his veneer of radical iconoclasm Dalin remained always respect-

ful and appreciative of the past. For the Swedish language he had an almost emotional affection. At a time when it was in disrepute, when it was encumbered with a multitude of foreign words, especially Latin and French, Dalin's masterly use of it demonstrated its great literary possibilities. Essentially Dalin was moderate in his rationalism, much like his teacher Rydelius.⁷⁰ And because he declined to break completely with the past, he, like Holberg, eventually was repudiated by a younger generation.

Around Dalin there developed a group of like-minded men, —courtiers, scholars, artists, all men of the world. When the sister of Frederick the Great, Louisa Ulrika, came to Sweden as the bride of the Crown Prince Frederick, she was delighted to find this group of kindred spirits, and promptly afforded them a prominent place at the court. Besides Dalin, there was the brilliant architect and artist, K. G. Tessin, who as Swedish ambassador to Paris (1739-1742) had been accepted by the innermost sanctum of Europe's intellectual capital. He dazzled the princess in Berlin when he came to escort her to Stockholm, and thereafter his acknowledged reputation in the world of art and his complete identity with French rationalism, kept him high in her regard.⁷¹ He wrote some delightful fables in French and Swedish. Others of this company were Axel von Fersen Sr. and Anders Johan von Höpken. Under their leadership the court became the centre of Swedish rationalism. From this centre it radiated to the Estates in the *riksdag*, to the upper bourgeoisie, to the universities, and to a minority of the clergy, finally to set its stamp upon the intellectual life of Sweden as it did upon that of Denmark-Norway and all of western European civilization.⁷²

CHAPTER IV



THE AGE OF REASON

During the long period of peace, the growing prosperity had begun to endow the middle class with that sense of freedom and beauty, which is the prerequisite of intellectual life . . .

For the epoch-making event is this, that the blood of actual life and the air of reality here enter the world of books. Formerly the learned wrote literature for one another, now there appear a genuine public and men of letters who write for it and not for colleagues. . . . And therefore they write directly out of life and for life; art and life enter into direct relationship with one another.¹

The Age of Reason, founded in Scandinavia by Holberg and Olof Dalin, was only relatively rationalistic. Human history is too complex and too organic to be divided into neat segments that can be accurately labelled. What is called the Age of Reason, as a matter of fact, was that only for the intelligentsia and not even wholly for them. Religious mysticism continued to thrive, new pseudo-scientific mystical tendencies became manifest, and a growing sentimentalism in art and literature heralded the advent of romanticism. Yet it is not inappropriate to call the second half of the eighteenth century the Age of Reason, because now for the first time since Hellenic civilization human reason was enthroned in cultivated circles as a determinant of human conduct.

I. THE SCIENCES

The typical rationalism of the eighteenth century stemmed from the development of the sciences. In that development Sweden and Denmark had some share prior to the year 1700, but not until the immediate effects of the Great Northern War had passed did scientific activity become a strong feature of Scandinavian intellectual life. For several decades after 1730, Swedish science occupied a very prominent place in Europe; Danish science was far behind in comparison. Several reasons

may be suggested for this disparity. In spite of her losses in the war, Sweden's economy recovered much more rapidly and completely than that of Denmark, where the one great enterprise—agriculture—stubbornly remained in a precarious condition throughout most of the century. The Swedish system of education was better than the Dano-Norwegian. In spite of the prevailing Lutheran orthodoxy in both countries, there was somewhat more freedom in Sweden than in Denmark. Pietism did not there enjoy official protection as in Denmark, and was therefore unable to exert the same stifling influence. Perhaps the most important factor, however, was the constant attention to technology required by the Swedish mining and iron industries. There was probably no country in Europe except England, where theoretical and applied science were allied so closely as in Sweden, and to England Swedish scientists were likely to go in search of further knowledge. Practically all of the important early Swedish scientists were directly concerned with mining. Christopher Polhem constructed machinery for bringing ore out of the mines (1690), and later (1694) studied mechanics in Holland and in England.² Mårten Triewald studied mechanics in England, became a member of the *Royal Society*, set up the first steam engine in Sweden at the Danne-mora mine (1728), and introduced Newtonian physics to Stockholm audiences (1728).³ Emanuel Swedenborg, who is far better known for his later religious mysticism than for his earlier scientific achievements, had daily converse with the great English scientists in London where he almost lost his balance in a mad chase from one science to another. Returning to Sweden a confirmed Newtonian, he was given an office in the Bureau of Mines as Polhem's assistant (1715). He continued his theoretical study of the sciences (for he was never content with one), in which he showed more truly prophetic insight than in religion.⁴

The interest in science led to the formation of societies for its promotion similar to the Royal Society in London and the Academy of Sciences in Paris. Erik Benzelius Jr., librarian and lecturer at Upsala, founded *Vetenskapssocieteten i Upsala* (Scientific Society in Upsala) in 1719; *Vetenskapsakademien* (Academy of Science) was founded in Stockholm in 1739. Not until 1742 did Copenhagen get such a society, *Videnskabernes*

Selskab. Norway had to wait until 1760, when *Det Trondhjemske Videnskabs-Selskab* (Scientific Society of Trondhjem) was established.⁵ Several local associations were formed, and subsequently each branch of science and of letters tended to organize separately. True to the spirit of the eighteenth century all of these early societies were highly utilitarian.

The development of the sciences in Scandinavia must be sketched briefly. Credit for laying the foundations in Sweden goes largely to Erik Benzelius, Jr., at Upsala and Anders Rydellius at Lund; they trained the rising generation of scholars and scientists and emancipated them from much of the tradition and prejudice of the seventeenth century. Of the early Swedish mathematicians and physicists—Polhem, Triewald and Swedenborg—enough has been said to indicate their places. Two mathematicians and astronomers whose renown extended far beyond the borders of Sweden were Anders Celsius (1701-1744) and Samuel Klingenshierna (1698-1765). In Denmark the leading mathematicians were Jens Høysgaard and the Norwegian Jens Kraft (1720-1765); neither was known far beyond Denmark, and it was only in the mature years of the latter that the achievements of Newton were assimilated by Danish scientists. So little respect did the Danes have for experimental physics that its professor at the university, Kratzenstein, was regarded as a publicly supported trickster. In the field of chemistry Denmark was also far behind Sweden, though the leaders of thought appreciated foreign advances. Sweden, however, produced some of the best chemists in Europe, Johan Gottschalk Wallerius wrote an important treatise on the chemistry of agriculture (1761);⁶ Karl Wilhelm Scheele (1742-1786), an apothecary's assistant in Köping, made epochmaking discoveries, such as the composition of the air, almost simultaneously with Lavoisier and Priestly; at the beginning of the next century, Jöns Jakob Berzelius (1779-1848) began his work which established the exact atomic and molecular weights for some two thousand simple and compound bodies and developed the modern system of chemical nomenclature.

In the realm of botany the name of Carl von Linné (1707-1778), dominates the whole century, not only in Sweden, but in all Europe. Linné was professor of medicine at Upsala. In Scandinavia the mercantilistic emphasis upon population as

an asset in the wealth of nations led inevitably to the problems of reducing death rates and preserving health. The decline in the old doctrine, unchanged by the Reformation, that disease and pestilence are unpreventable divine retribution for sin, stimulated scientific medicine, and physicians founded the science of botany because an inventory of plants was necessary to discover their medicinal uses. Here, therefore, as in the case of mathematics, physics and chemistry,⁷ the practical, utilitarian bourgeois spirit of the eighteenth century bore rich fruit. Linné's great achievement was, of course, his scientific system of classifying plants. His great renown attracted many students from foreign countries, and his trained Swedish students were everywhere in demand as curators of botanical gardens.⁸ In Denmark there was no such original genius as Linné, but there were capable scientists who had either been trained by him or who followed his methods, especially Oeder, Fabricius, and Zoëga. In Norway, Bishop Johan Ernst Gunnerus, one of the founders of the Scientific Society of Trondhjem, and a disciple of Linné, performed valuable work, both in botany and zoölogy. Few of these men confined their interests to one science; botanists and physicians were therefore often also students of their country's fauna. Geology and mineralogy flourished most, as might be expected, in Sweden, where the interest in mining afforded them a basis in practical life. Anders Celsius, in addition to his work in astronomy and physics, propounded a theory concerning the geological formation of the Scandinavian peninsula, which caused Olof Dalin to discard the Biblical chronology when he wrote *Svea Rikes Historia*.

In the spheres of medicine, anatomy, surgery, and biology, the Danes did better than in most others. The Bartholin family and Ole Worm had distinguished themselves in the last years of the seventeenth century. A so-called anatomical theatre had been established in Copenhagen as early as 1644. "All the movements of the age are reflected in Danish medical science."⁹ Pietistic influence from the university in Halle, together with the rationalistic deification of the natural, caused a reaction away from drastic methods and a wholesome emphasis upon exercise and moderate habits. The invention of the microscope and the discovery of microscopic organisms, early in the eighteenth century, promptly gave rise to new theories concerning

the origin of disease. Surgery and obstetrics made notable advances, and in 1714 state examinations were established for midwives. Dr. Simon Crüger founded a college of anatomy and surgery in Copenhagen in 1736. In Sweden, Emanuel Swedenborg's turn from mechanical to biological researches was typical of a tendency to abandon the increasingly unsatisfactory mechanistic conception of the universe for one that should be dynamic.¹⁰ This trend expressed itself toward the close of the century in a growing belief in the evolutionary origin of the universe and man.¹¹ The catastrophic cattle epidemics gave rise to the veterinary science. P. C. Abildgaard (1740-1801) was sent by the Danish government to Lyon to study under Bourgelat, and in 1773, with the aid of Struensée, founded the Copenhagen veterinary college. Three Swedish students were also given assistance to study at Lyon and one of them, Peter Hernqvist, returned to found the institute at Skara in 1784.

In the Scandinavian countries as in the rest of Europe the successful application of human reason to the more exact sciences was followed by attempts to apply it to the social sciences. The study of economic theory, which began in the first half of the century, resembled such theory elsewhere.¹² The writing of history entered a new era when rational methods began to be adopted. Before the enlightenment, criticism of sources was all but unknown. The Biblical chronology was accepted without question like many a popular fable, even gross superstition. Religious and dynastic interests determined subject matter. Now, however, new methods and new interests began to prevail. The universal success of the scientific method indicated clearly how historians must discover the truth. In Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland professional and amateur historians assembled manuscripts into collections which have ever since been basic to the writing of Scandinavian history.¹³ And now these sources were subjected to criticism. Erik Benzelius, Jr., at Upsala, began the task of debunking the Swedish history of the Rudbeck school. He also performed invaluable spadework in the study of Ulfilas' Gothic Bible. Ludvig Holberg voiced the demand for critical history in Denmark-Norway, and quite frankly recognized his own shortcomings.¹⁴ The mounting influence of the bourgeoisie and their rationalistic

ideal combined to broaden the base of historical interest. Religion receded more and more into the background; dynasties became mere chronological conveniences. The Scandinavian historians were in tune with their age, for they obeyed Pope's dictum to make mankind the object of man's study. They gave the plain people a more prominent place in their works, they devoted less space to military and more to economic events and inaugurated a study of institutions. Like Voltaire in the *Siècle de Louis XIV*, the Scandinavian historians in that century approached *Kulturgeschichte*. Holberg had a profound distaste for military heroics, and preferred quiet civic development.¹⁵ Olof Dalin gave the commonplace more consideration than was usual; and his contemporary, Sven Lagerbring (1707-1787), a better historian, made a critical study of the Swedish middle ages.¹⁶ The competent student of Norwegian history, Gerhard Schöning (1722-1780), made his debut with a monograph on "The Marriages and Weddings of Our Ancient Scandinavian Forefathers."¹⁷ Besides this standard historical activity there was an active interest in so-called topographical studies, which often included material to delight the modern sociologist.

At the beginning of the next century history gave the study of law a new basis, but the enlightenment deserves credit for the modern revival of legal science. The new law code of Sweden (1734) was largely the work of the seventeenth century, but its final adoption stimulated some commentary. In Denmark the new university charter (1732) made more liberal provision for the study of law, which, under the influence of the Dutch and German naturalistic school, was engrossing an increasing amount of attention. The German physician and historian, Andreas Höjer, assumed one of the professorships in law provided by the new charter and achieved results that entitle him to be called the father of modern Danish jurisprudence.¹⁸

The linguistic studies gained no less than others from a more democratic culture and more exact methods. Philology in the Scandinavian countries had been mere antiquarianism; it tended now to become a rational science, a study of a phase of civilization. Archaeology experienced the same evolution. The Danish Egyptologist, Georg Zoëga, pointed out in 1797

that the hieroglyphics would become intelligible when some document should be discovered carrying parallel texts of Greek and hieroglyphics. From this point Champollion began, and in 1799 discovered the Rosetta Stone. Zoëga furthermore made Coptic understandable to European scholars. In 1761, the Danish King, Frederick V, financed the important scientific expedition of the German-Danish Carsten Niebuhr to Arabia and Persia, an expedition in which Swedish scholars also participated.¹⁹ Folklore and the living dialects began to arouse interest. Olof Dalin wrote some of his best things in the folklore style; in Denmark-Norway Erik Pontoppidan published a collection of folk-lore and proverbs; and Hans and Paul Egede studied the language of the Greenland Eskimos.

A very notable achievement of this century was the rehabilitation of the Danish and the Swedish languages. This was going on elsewhere in Europe too, particularly in England. The peculiar linguistic situation in Norway, largely due to the socio-political organization of that country, was little touched by the culture of the eighteenth century except as the Danish language, spoken by the Norwegian urban and official classes, was affected.²⁰ At the beginning of the century, both Swedish and Danish were in a state of decay. Although vernacular of really sublime quality had been written in both countries during and for a short time after the religious upheavals, at the opening of the eighteenth century it was suffering both from anemia and parasites. Lacking all inner vitality both languages were used by the cultured classes almost apologetically, with a generous admixture of Latin, French and German. The learned gild wrote Latin, the upper social classes chiefly French or German. For this state of affairs there were good reasons. In both countries the formalism of a pedantically humanistic education was little modified by Lutheran orthodoxy. Theology, the dominant cultural interest, had its roots in the writings of the Latin and German church fathers. Both countries had close political ties with Germany and France; Sweden had extensive German-speaking provinces in the Baltic and was closely allied with France; Denmark held Schleswig and Holstein. After 1660, moreover, the Danish kings were absolute, and since they had acquired that power against the will of the native nobility, they preferred to select their officials from among the German

nobility. The military language in Denmark was predominantly German; the trade of both countries was largely with Germany. Both countries were dazzled by the age of Louis XIV, and tried to compensate for their own poverty by imitating the French language. The Scandinavian languages were at much the same immature stage of development as the English before the age of Elizabeth.²¹

At the close of the seventeenth, but especially in the eighteenth century, several factors operated to revive the native Swedish and Danish languages. In the first place the artificial language of the seventeenth century, cultivated only by the learned and by the nobility, was the language of a limited and a sterile social group; the ascent of bourgeois culture marked its end.

What constitutes a people's language cannot be determined solely by a consideration of its literature. The literary language may be artificial and foreign to the people, properly so-called, and in that case it may often be forced to give way to one that is more natural. In that manner disappeared the sort of Swedish which was written in the seventeenth century . . . , it disappeared because it was maintained only by one class of Swedes, not by the Swedish people.²²

The unlearned but eager bourgeoisie required information that could be understood without a dictionary. Another factor was the utilitarian spirit of the new intelligentsia; it was cosmopolitan rather than narrowly nationalistic in outlook, but it had faith in its message, and believed that a pliant, well developed vernacular was its best medium. No one has better expressed this belief than J. S. Sneedorff, one of the men who did most to purify the Danish language:

I respect all the sciences, but I respect them according to their usefulness, and their greatest utility is to make us human beings, Christians, and citizens. One language is no dearer to me, as a language, than any other. They are all but means with which to disseminate knowledge. Thus considered the mother tongue has the advantage, and we resemble the Greeks and Romans more when we cultivate it, than when we pollute their languages. Danish has been neglected, no one denies that, and yet the first essential to the dissemination of knowledge is a well cultivated language. I have demonstrated some of the defects of the mother tongue and their causes, and I have no doubt said often enough, that that has not been for the sake of being able to say something beautiful or brilliant therein. My purpose was something far more important, namely to

improve the general mode of thought, to make known what is useful in the sciences, to convey the truths of religion in a convincing and touching manner . . . It was consequently for the sake of the facts, the thought, and the truth, that I wished a more active cultivation of the language.²³

The scientific societies in Scandinavia differed from many of their foreign predecessors in employing the vernaculars from the beginning.²⁴

There were two other important factors. The pietistic movement, in its appeal to the masses, was forced to use their language, and did so even in university lecture halls. Patriotism also played a part, for the loss of the German Baltic provinces accentuated the Swedish character of what remained after 1720. It is the patriotic note that dominates Olof Dalin's well known eulogy of the Swedish language.²⁵ In Denmark, during the third quarter of the century patriotic resentment grew against the foreign, chiefly German, bureaucracy. This resentment, and the bland manner in which Struensée ignored it, was largely instrumental in his downfall (1773).²⁶ Thereafter the native Danish minister, Ove Høeg Guldberg, "taught the court to speak Danish." Curiously, at about the same time a group of Norwegian writers (*Det Norske Selskab*) in Copenhagen were most strenuously resisting the German influence and upholding the dignity of the Danish language.²⁷

Except for a few feeble voices which were raised late in the seventeenth century against the degradation of the national languages, nothing was done, either in Sweden or Denmark, to improve them. In this matter as in so many others Ludvig Holberg was the Danish pioneer, and Andreas Rydelius and Olof Dalin the Swedish ones. Holberg shocked his learned contemporaries by his unconventional style; in his comedies he openly ridiculed their pedantic prattle. He fully understood that he could not reach the plain people if he did not write a language that they could comprehend, and he enjoyed conversing with the peasants on his estates because they spoke an uncorrupted, if somewhat cumbersome, Danish. But he was too moderate a man to break completely with the learned style, as his younger successors did. They were far more revolutionary than he, and could afford to be,—thanks to the breach that he made for them. J. S. Sneedorff very properly regarded the

vernacular as the best weapon in the struggle against conservatism,²⁸ and in his journal, *Den Patriotiske Tilskuer*, demonstrated that it could very well be made the medium, not only of comedy such as Holberg had written, but of culture and learning. With J. S. Sneedorff and Frederick Christian Eilschow (1725-1750) the language problem became a challenge to battle. Sneedorff and his generation were too completely dominated by the French influence, however, to develop a wholly modern vernacular. That became, in turn, the task of their successors.²⁹ In Sweden, it was Andreas Rydelius who first wrote a philosophical work in the native language, and at his institution—Lund—an official university document was first couched in that tongue.³⁰ Olof Dalin and his *Argus*, however, made the real beginning in Sweden. In the utilitarian spirit of his age, but with a national patriotism to which the Danish reformers were as yet insensible, Dalin, from December, 1732, until the close of 1734, wrote a Swedish, which proved far better than any argument that the language was pliant as well as robust. Well versed himself in the literature of Scandinavian antiquity, he pled for its short, pithy sentences and its savory diction.³¹ The movement thus begun to purify and develop the Swedish language met almost no opposition.³²

The scientific societies quickly manifested interest in the language question. This was especially true of the Scientific Society in Upsala and the Academy of Science in Stockholm. In Copenhagen a special society, the Danish Society for the History and the Language of the Fatherland, which was formed in 1745, made notable contributions. Scandinavian scholars were well aware of the important results achieved in Italy and France by the compilation of dictionaries, and they were busily engaged in similar more or less private undertakings. The Upsala Society began to consider the preparation of a Swedish dictionary in 1731, and soon found a superbly equipped young linguist to do the work, Johan Ihre. The result was the monumental *Glossarium Sævo-Gothicum*, published in 1769. Eilschow published a small dictionary of the Danish language in the late 1740's, and J. S. Sneedorff made a similar effort in 1761.³³ Thus began the renaissance of the native Swedish and Danish languages, which has continued, strengthened by the rising force of national sentiment, until the present day.

II. RATIONALISM AT ITS HEIGHT (1750-1790)

Once it had begun to blow, the zephyr of reason and science quickly developed the proportions of a stiff breeze. Except in the practical sciences, the Scandinavian countries showed little originality; it was a European wind that was blowing. Scandinavian rationalism received its inspiration from England, France, and Germany. In the sphere of religion it followed the moderate German deism of Christian Wolff, rather than the radical atheism of Hume and Holbach, and even Wolffianism tended to become more conservative in the Northern Countries, especially in Sweden. Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Helvetius, Rousseau, the Encyclopedists, all had their followers, more or less devoted. A large colony of foreign scholars, artists, and teachers were welcomed to Copenhagen by the powerful minister of Frederick V, J. H. E. Bernstorff, who believed that they were quite as necessary to the stimulation of Danish culture as the importation of British foremen and factory managers was to that of industry. A few of the most notable of these men deserve to be named. There was the French Swiss, Mallet, Necker's friend, who edited the *Mercure Danois*, and whom Bernstorff attached to the legation in Paris for the sole purpose of keeping Denmark informed of events in "the republic of letters."³⁴ Reverdil, another Genevan, became tutor to Christian VII. The two prominent French artists, J. F. Saly and N. H. Jardin, made important contributions to the Danish baroque. From Germany came the physicist Kratzenstein, the botanist Oeder, the theologian Crämer, the jurist Höjer, all of whom helped to make Danish intellectual history, and finally no less a personage than Klopstock himself. "That the calling of so large a force of foreign talent might endanger the national culture did not occur to a man with Bernstorff's cosmopolitan training."³⁵

Not only were foreign ideas and foreign talent imported; new literary forms and social institutions followed. There was an epidemic of Spectator journals; most successful were Dalin's *Then Swänska Argus* and J. S. Sneedorff's *Den Patriotiske Tilskuer*.³⁶ The English coffee-house and the French *salon* appeared. Scientific societies, literary groups, and social clubs flourished, although lofty purposes were often forgotten over the cups.³⁷

This culture concentrated in larger urban communities and the university towns, and radiated into other communities through representatives of the classes that were its bearers. Norway had no university, nor any special cultural center; but the extraordinary prosperity of her merchants in the second half of the century created the necessary material basis for a bourgeois enlightenment. In Christiania old merchant families became wealthy and developed a veritable patriciate. They were exclusive, proud, but sober; their trade was with England, and to England they sent their sons to learn or to manage their businesses. Not all of them enjoyed, like the Collet's and Bernt Anker, the friendship of a Sir Joseph Banks, or association with the members of the Royal Society over which he presided,³⁸ but all who had lived in England, or whose economic interests were there, became thoroughly imbued with English middle-class culture. The Norwegian clergy, like the deans and masters of the Latin schools, were trained at Copenhagen, and in Norway they attempted to practice the enlightened philosophy of that metropolis.

Scandinavian and European enlightenment cherished the same ideals. Freedom of thought, press, and discussion was a primary demand. Reasonable thinking, it was believed, would attain the highest possible degree of perfection only when constantly exposed to criticism; and only when the problems of society might be freely discussed could they have any reasonable solution. Although the authorities at first resisted the demand for freedom of the press, in 1755 Frederick V relaxed the censorship for discussions of economic conditions, in 1766 freedom of the press was decreed in Sweden with safeguards only for the sanctity of religion and majesty, and in 1770, when Struensee entirely freed the press in Denmark-Norway, he released forces of public opinion which eventually felled him. A decade later, the liberty enjoyed in Denmark-Norway excited the envy of the German Lessing.³⁹

The passion for enlightenment and education was no less strong in Scandinavia than elsewhere. Supremely, almost ridiculously confident in its fundamental principles, this generation expected to establish a Heavenly City of Reason by a broadened process of education.⁴⁰ With magnificent boldness they challenged the narrow learning of the schools. In their popular

journals and writings they democratized knowledge and conducted a never-ending warfare upon superstition. Yet even their zeal could not wholly cut away the underbrush of credulity, and enough remained to condition popular thought processes even down to the present. The high tide of the struggle against superstition was reached in Sweden when in 1778 Gustav III secured the abolition of the laws permitting prosecution for witchcraft, and in Denmark-Norway when the barbarous custom of exorcism was dropped from the liturgy (1783).⁴¹

Freedom of press and education were considered, however, merely as means of achieving certain ends. Utilitarianism was the very fibre of this age—as intensely zealous, and sometimes as unrelated to reality, as the spirit of the religious missionaries. Its gospel was salvation in this world, salvation by work and intelligence. Holberg preached inoculation for small-pox; Dalin and J. S. Sneedorff deprecated the excessive devotion to the dead languages and urged the study of the modern; the economists, like Duhre, made their formal bow to religion by admitting in a few lines that the fear of the Lord is the prerequisite of a successful society and thereafter definitely assumed that man was master of his own fate.⁴²

Politically the Scandinavian Age of Reason was fully as conservative as the continental. In Denmark-Norway benevolent despotism was accepted as natural and normal by Holberg in the 1720's, and by Boye in the 1790's. The chaotic period of the *Hats* and the *Caps* in Sweden, culminating in the seizure of practically absolute power by the royal rationalist Gustav III (1773) somewhat strengthened faith in absolutism, although the Swedes never quite forgot their disastrous experience with Charles XII. Throughout the century, however, leaders in both countries were conversant with the political philosophies of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau; the idea of the social contract was accepted, and even to a large extent the doctrine of the natural civic equality of all men.⁴³

In all three countries, but especially in Norway, the increasing sense of economic interdependence within the nation was reviving patriotism; the inevitable result was that the bourgeois intelligentsia took a far more active interest in political affairs, which they justified on the ground that they must assist in pro-

viding information as a basis for intelligent legislation.⁴⁴ It is worth noting that it was in the second half of the eighteenth century that the word *borger* (burgher, bourgeois) came to be adopted as the Scandinavian equivalent for *citizen*. J. S. Sneedorff, writing in 1761, hesitated to use it so, but by the close of the century it was accepted usage.⁴⁵ And yet the Age of Reason was marked predominantly, in Scandinavia as well as elsewhere, not by national patriotism, but by a cosmopolitan spirit. Rationalists emphasized the constructive arts of peace, not those of national conflict. In Holberg's *Potus* the wars of Alexander and of Caesar were held in the same horrible remembrance as murder. Clason contends that this cosmopolitanism was partly responsible for the nonchalance with which leading men in Finland accepted the overlordship of Russia in 1809.⁴⁶

The Scandinavians did not escape the tendency to idealize primitive man and strange civilizations. Holberg (*Niels Klim*) used them merely as beasts of burden for his own ideas, but subsequent writers, J. S. Sneedorff, Tyge Rothe, Jens Kraft, and others, influenced chiefly by Rousseau, looked upon Greenlanders and Chinese as more natural, and therefore more ideal, than Europeans. Jens Kraft, Professor at Sorö, Newtonian mathematician and physicist, linguist, and philosopher, was especially influenced by Rousseau; he urged the abandonment of luxury and a return to natural simplicity. Even earlier than Percy in England and Herder in Germany, Kraft began to seek an explanation of the modern in the primitive man and taught a doctrine of social evolution.⁴⁷ The primitive Scandinavian and his literature, both the sagas of antiquity and the folklore of more recent times, were studied. Mallet's *Northern Antiquities* was translated into English by Thomas Percy himself (1770). Most especially did the Norwegian and Swedish peasants become objects of popular admiration; the followers of Rousseau extolled them as wholesome primitives, those of Quesnay as virile producers of wealth.⁴⁸ Holberg was a misanthrope in town, but very sociable in the country among the unsophisticated peasantry.

Basic to all these principles was individualism. Freedom of press and expression was freedom for the individual; education must not be designed to develop a class with special group characteristics, but independent individuals capable of doing useful

work. The enlightenment was willing to leave the responsibility for government in the hands of one individual, provided only that other individuals should be free to render constructive criticism and be eligible for subordinate offices on the basis of merit. The cosmopolitan disregard of nationalism was the inevitable consequence of an individualism that transcended mere group loyalties, an individualism which scorned to subordinate any one man to a category less inclusive than the totality of all men. Only where the influence of the aristocracy was dominant, especially in the higher forms of literary and artistic expression, was the particular subordinated to the abstract,—and even there middle class individualism asserted itself more powerfully. This enthusiasm for detail was the very essence of the age: science was engaged in accumulating detailed information, and pietistic religion was emphasizing individual salvation and morality. J. S. Sneedorff sums it all up:

Particular things alone have reality, and that which we call species and genera are only conceptions which we deduce from the particulars. That which in this world is called the common good is often a chimera, as for example a glowing state of affairs, a nation's external position and power, which causes the whole people to be more highly respected by others without adding anything to the happiness of most of the individual persons and families... The maintenance of the species cannot be the sole purpose of God.⁴⁹

Religion, of course, was influenced by the Age of Reason. The theories of the German Lutheran theologian, Christian Wolff (1679-1754) were most generally accepted in the universities of Denmark and Sweden, and therefore by the clergy that they trained. Wolff attempted a superficial and facile reconciliation of reason with revelation. Once the thesis had been accepted that there could be no conflict between revealed and scientific truth, it was possible by interpretation of the Scripture to bring the two into some harmony. These efforts, which to a modern mind frequently seem puerile,⁵⁰ at least indicate a departure from still more primitive religious forms. Within the Dano-Norwegian and the Swedish ecclesiastical systems deism remained comparatively moderate, and with a few exceptions among the laity also. Although Holberg was probably more radical than most of his successors, a distinct anti-clerical, atheistic tendency was evident at the close of the century. To

describe one attitude as typical is therefore quite impossible. There were curious and troubled transitional types, like the pastor in Slidre, Norway, Herman Rüge (1706-1764), an enthusiast for the practical work demanded by the enlightenment, who nevertheless shrank back in horror from some of Holberg's ideas;⁵¹ and there were cocksure modernists like the Danish Bishop Bastholm. Men and women of the world, like Queen Louisa Ulrika and Olof Dalin, might burlesque preaching in the manner of Voltaire and still retain a great deal of respect for religion; Dalin wrote a treatise on God's providence that even a man of such primitive piety as Linné could cherish, and K. G. Tessin wrote hymns expressive of real religious devotion.⁵² Writers on religious subjects almost always preserved the terminology and the forms of Lutheran Christianity, however liberal they might be in interpreting them. Laurids Smith, rector of the Trondhjem cathedral school and secretary of the Royal Norwegian Scientific Society, is one of the exceptions which proves the rule; he wrote a textbook on natural religion without referring once to the Bible and without mentioning either Jesus or the Holy Ghost.⁵³ On the other hand, even such a pietist as Bishop Erik Pontoppidan attempted to justify dogma by reason.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, even moderate deists were comparatively few among the practicing clergy.

The avowed rationalists throughout the whole eighteenth century satirized the clergy for intellectual mediocrity, laziness and acquisitiveness, faults which were deplorably common and which stood in glaring contrast to its professions of culture and renunciation.⁵⁵ Nevertheless the one rationalist ideal which most influenced the clergy was that of being useful. Many pastors who continued to preach the mysteries of salvation, also preached a gospel of practical service—and practiced it themselves. They served their congregations in many capacities. In all three countries, they actively promoted sanitation and public health; the Swedish pastor Chydenius and others fought successfully for inoculation against smallpox; the governments ordered them to distribute medicines and to warn against quackery. On their parsonage farms the pastors often conducted demonstrations in agriculture; they promoted the introduction of new crops, especially the potato,—in Norway so zealously that they were named the "potato preachers." They

frequently found time to make genuine contributions to the sciences, and to write treatises on economics. The German traveller and member of the Royal Academy of Science in Berlin, Leopold von Buch, visited the Norwegian provost Pihl at his parsonage in Hedemarken, Norway, in 1810, and wrote an enthusiastic description of this amateur astronomer, physicist, and mechanical inventor. "His house is like a factory, and his example and leadership have already exerted a great influence in the environs."⁵⁶ For the old belief in predestination for salvation some of these pastors substituted a faith in the perfectibility of man and his predestination for a happier material existence.⁵⁷ In their desire to establish the religion of reason on a firm foundation, the more advanced bishops attempted to translate the Bible and the prayerbooks into the language of actual life. They ignored the church fathers and their books, preferring to go back to the sources of the Christian religion itself, but their translations almost always proved unacceptable. The work of the Swedish Bible Commission, 1773-1793, was rejected, and the New Testament translation of Bishop Bastholm in Denmark was a mere individual effort. For this there were several reasons. The translations usually contrasted unfavorably with the rich ceremonial language of earlier editions; they often engaged in specious rationalistic explanations that were hardly less credible than the mysteries they attempted to clear away; and, in spite of the dominance of deism in the few cultural centers, there still remained a great mass of inarticulate religious conservatism. Bastholm's proposal, in 1785, to vitalize the religious service by permitting the use of concerts, comedies, and a more active participation of the congregation, precipitated a feud which reverberated in the press for many years.⁵⁸ Only a revised hymnary and a school book by Bishop Balle were adopted officially in Denmark; and in Sweden one or two similar neologistic books were adopted. It has been customary for historians to dismiss these revisionist efforts of the rationalistic clergy as the supreme proof of their sterility. The truth is, however, that the prevalent orthodox Lutheranism was no less sterile. The masses in all three countries were never religiously aroused until the great popular religious movements of the nineteenth century. The revisionist work of the late eighteenth century, however, demonstrated the need for moderniz-

ing the church language and furnished many of the materials with which that task was later accomplished.

Scandinavian literature in the period of full-blown enlightenment presented many interesting cross currents, indicating how the middle class groped its way forward to cultural maturity. At the conclusion of the Great Northern War even the urban communities and the lesser aristocracy used literary forms highly similar to those of the countryside. Some of the old ballads and sentimental lays were still being sung, and dancing was accompanied by mass singing. Especially was this true in Sweden.⁵⁹ The rise of the Spectator style of literature has already been described. Both in form and content its plain, matter-of-fact, conversational tone suited the bourgeoisie. So dominant did this literary type become in the 1740's that even the schoolmen tried to employ it to propagate their obsolete viewpoints, sometimes with ludicrous results.⁶⁰ The novel was another literary form which the Scandinavians adopted from the English, both by direct translation and by original production. Richardson's *Pamela* was translated into Danish in 1743, three years after its first appearance, and immediately found imitators. The sentimental novel quickly became the most popular form of literature among the middle classes, and as their prosperity increased the publication of novels became profitable. As a result of the introduction of the essay and the novel, together with the purification of the vernaculars, Scandinavian prose was enormously improved.

Poetry did not fare equally well. The age of reason was unfavorable to poetic sentiment, for its insistence upon precision and its extroverted didacticism tended to produce poetry that was mechanically correct but without foundation in inner experience. Some beautiful hymns were written, in the first decades of the eighteenth century under the influence of pietism (Jacob Frese and Olof Kolmodin in Sweden) and in the last decades under the influence of emergent romanticism (Johan Nordal Brun in Norway and Johan Olof Wallin in Sweden). The dominant mode in poetry was French classicism, which owing to its punctillious, aristocratic form never appealed to the middle classes, even though their poets manfully struggled to master it. That they should make this effort is not strange. There were comparatively few commoners, in the beginning,

who could afford to share the culture of the aristocracy and they therefore gave that culture an excessive veneration, as parvenus are wont to do. Furthermore, this was the period in which the middle class was pursuing its objectives by an unconsciously evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, process; consequently it tried to imitate the culture of the aristocracy rather than develop its own. The shadow of Voltaire lies upon almost every page of poetry and drama written between 1750 and 1785, and in the abstract idealism, logical structure, and dictional lucidity of this literature the French influence is apparent. If French classicism was too formal for true poetry, it nevertheless imparted to Scandinavian writers a sense of those important fundamentals.⁶¹ When the Swedish Academy was founded, in 1786, it quickly became the citadel of this literary style, just as in France, with the result that when romanticism swept over Sweden it had to take the form of a literary revolt.

Among the outstanding literary representatives of the Swedish enlightenment who employed the French classicist style was Gustav Philip Creutz (1731-1785). In spite of his father's pietism, Creutz became the respected friend of Voltaire. A man of the world to his fingertips who as Swedish ambassador at Paris was welcome in the most exclusive circles, he wrote a pastoral play, *Atis och Camilla* (1761), after the pattern of Voltaire's *Henriade*. Philosophically he was an epicurean materialist and sceptic.⁶² Gustaf Fredrik Gyllenborg (1731-1808), a close friend of Creutz, wrote his best and earliest works in the same style, but with less good humor, and Dalin himself, in 1754, laid down the rule that poetry should concern itself with abstract thought and correct form, not with incidental minutiae. During the reign of Gustav III, the French classicist form enjoyed royal support and the king's own dramas followed the pattern of Corneille and Racine. Gustav III, furthermore, showered the last and foremost of this group, Leopold and Kellgren, with special favors. Carl Gustaf af Leopold (1756-1829) is noteworthy not so much for what he wrote, though *Predikaren* (*The Preacher*, 1794), still enjoys high rank, as for the complete loyalty with which he always defended the school to which he belonged. He was one of the most confirmed opponents within the Swedish Academy of the romanticist group. But the foremost representative of the classicist type was Johan

Henrik Kellgren (1751-1795). He skillfully worked himself into the favor of Gustav III with a number of poems and with the opera text *Adonis och Proserpina* (1778); but it was in *Våra Villor* (*Our Passions*, 1780) that he revealed his true character, that of a complete agnostic to whom Christian morality and immorality were nothing. In the last verse Kellgren bids ugly "truth" to flee and asks what difference it makes if our passions betray us if they but make us happy.⁶³ As long as the enlightenment was securely dominant, Kellgren refrained from promoting any cause, but when, in the 1780's, mystic orders and fraternities appeared on every hand he began an almost single-handed, but witty and caustic, crusade on behalf of common sense. There is little in Swedish literature to compare with the holy wrath of the murderous satire, *Man äger ej snille för det man är galen* (*One may be no genius even if one is mad*, 1787).⁶⁴ Kellgren proposed that one more fraternity be founded, *Pro sensu communi*, and that among its basic principles should be the thesis: "Show me a grand fraternity brother who is not also a petty human being." This was Kellgren in a new role. Hitherto he had goodhumoredly satirized the foibles of the men he met on his leisurely way; now he revealed an earnestness of character, which, though it was exerted on behalf of the fading enlightenment, presaged his later sympathy with romanticism.⁶⁵

The Swedes, often called the Frenchmen of the North, mastered the French classicist style far more completely than the Dano-Norwegians; by comparison the works of the latter seem almost tawdry. The literary groups in Denmark-Norway admired and imitated French culture throughout the whole century, but were also in more direct contact than the Swedes with the English and German preromanticists. Furthermore, the Danish court was presided over by no such disciple of Voltaire as Gustav III. The most important representatives of the French classicist style there were the Norwegians, Johan Nordal Brun (1754-1816), Claus Fasting (1746-1791) and Johan Herman Wessel (1742-1785). Brun published the tragedy *Zarine* in 1771, a mediocre and overwrought drama which, nevertheless, exerted a considerable influence upon the younger generation. Fasting, a man of fine intelligence and noble character, wrote *Hermione* (1771), but is properly and better known for his

administrative and journalistic activity. Both of these dramas, poor as they are, have been somewhat underestimated because they were made the butts of Wessel's devastating parody, *Kjærlighed Uden Strømper* (*Love Without Stockings*, 1772). Wessel, like Brun and Fasting, was a member of the famous Norwegian literary club in Copenhagen, *Det norske Selskab* (The Norwegian Society), which upheld French and native Dano-Norwegian culture against the arrogant and disorderly Germanizing influences which were so active just before and during the Struensee period. Wessel had no intention to make war upon the French classicist style and culture, but merely to lampoon such poor imitations as *Zarine*. So effectively did he satirize them, however, that even the genuine examples of the school became a laughing stock; he practically killed what he was trying to protect. Wessel's parody was translated into Swedish too, and became deservedly popular; it drifted through the miasma of affectations which the "lofty" style had engendered like a purifying wind, and contributed much, especially in Denmark-Norway, to prepare the way for a naturalistic romanticism. The Norwegian Society, and particularly Wessel, was wholly bourgeois.⁶⁶

III. EMERGENT ROMANTICISM

Scandinavian literature, in the last half of the eighteenth century, exhibited many symptoms of the advancing romanticist trend which was becoming pronounced in England and Germany. Rousseau's influence, manifest at first in the aristocrats' attempts to combine simplicity with elegance, eventually produced an excessive emphasis upon the sentimental and the natural. Young's *Night Thoughts* (1742 ff.) and Thomson's *The Seasons* (1730 ff.) taught Scandinavian poets and thinkers to appreciate nature's moods; and the German *Sturm und Drang* literature, especially the writings of Herder, Lessing, Klopstock, and Schiller, enjoyed the flattery of many imitations. But the greatest significance of emergent romanticism was its middle class basis. The long period of comparative peace enjoyed by the Scandinavian countries in the eighteenth century, together with the accelerated rate of economic development, placed this class on a basis of material equality with the aristocracy and imbued it with a spirit of self confidence which inevitably found literary and artistic expression. The emphasis

in this new literature was placed upon individual experience, and upon the individual's adjustment to his environment. Therefore the aristocratic emphasis upon the abstract, the typical and the objective retired before the middle class interest in the concrete, the individual and the subjective. It is no doubt true that all literature is confession, but this new literature was personal confession which made its appeal in terms of the similar experiences of a large number of individual human beings.⁶⁷

The eighteenth century Scandinavian pre-romanticists were distinctly transitional types who had learned the craft in the French classicist school but were privately and experimentally moving toward new techniques. The Swedish poetess, Hedvig Charlotta Nordenflycht (1718-1763), for example, regarded herself and was regarded by her contemporaries as an exponent of the high classicist tradition. Yet she had been profoundly influenced by Rousseau, and she enjoys a noble place in Swedish literature today because she was unable to corset her feminine feelings in the tightfitting garment of the impersonal and the abstract. Even her earliest work, *Den Sörjande Turturdufvan* (*The Sorrowing Turtledove*, 1743) written before she had been exposed to Rousseau and before the new English and German literature had reached Sweden, is a noteworthy personal document.⁶⁸ Her contemporaries, Creutz and Gyllenborg, though primarily the representatives of the aristocratic style, were much influenced by Young and Thomson. Gyllenborg wrote *Världsföraktaren* (*I Renounce the World*, about 1760) in the pessimistic spirit that swept over Europe after the Lisbon earthquake in 1755 and gave the first Swedish expression of Rousseau's simplicity message; in *Människans Elände* (*The Misery of Man*) he shows the influence of Young, and in *Vinterkvädet* (*Song of Winter*) of Thomson. Creutz's *Sommarkvädet* (*Song of Summer*, 1785) likewise imitated Thomson's *Seasons*.⁶⁹ Jan Gabriel Oxenstierna (1750-1808) might, if he had been true to his own personality and had promptly published his works, have enjoyed the place of a pioneer in Swedish literature, for he had genuine ability. But he preferred the life of a courtier and statesman; therefore he delayed publication until the thought and style of his earlier work had been accepted. *Natten* (*The Night*) is Thomsonian in its fine elegy, and in *Skördarna* (*Harvests*) Oxenstierna, too, showed the

influence of *The Seasons* via Saint Lambert's *Les Saisons* and foreshadowed the national Swedish romanticism of Geijer's *Manhem* (*Home of Manhood*); but *Skördarna* was not published until 1796.⁷⁰

The most original genius in Swedish literature during the Gustavian era was Carl Michael Bellman (1740-1795), a merry but poverty stricken clerk in the civil service. Untouched by any influence he expressed the joys and sorrows and daily life of the Stockholm bourgeoisie in lyric verses which he set to musical accompaniment upon his guitar. A childlike, sensitive soul with no aptitude for affecting the "grand style," he was deliberately excluded from the company of recognized poets in *Utile Dulci*; therefore he founded his own club, The Order of Bacchus, which became a living caricature of the whole fraternity-humbug. No one might be admitted who had not at least twice been publicly dragged out of the gutter. In this curious society, which met in a notorious wine cellar, Bellman poured forth his lyrical cycle, *Fredmans Epistlar*, a realistic description of the life of a besotted watchmaker whose name was Fredman. The songs were learned and sung by almost every househo'd. It is proof of the sound literary sense of Gustav III that he kept his eye on Bellman and assisted him in need. No more than Robert Burns, with whom he has a number of affinities, can Bellman be fitted neatly into any literary category; but his spontaneity, his love of life, and his emotionalism were qualities that the romanticists appreciated.⁷¹

The last decade of the century brought Swedish pre-romanticism to flood tide. Even the olympian Kellgren steered his ship into the current. In *Den Nya Skapelsen eller Inbildningens Värld* (*The New Creation or the World of Imagination*, 1790), he sounded notes which were echoed again and again by the romanticists: "the harmony of the spheres," "the harps of angels sounding from the mountain tops," "the cry of evil spirits rising up from the depths."⁷² And whereas he had formerly heaped contumely upon Bellman, he edited *Fredmans Epistlar* in 1795 and wrote an acute appreciation of the popular poet.⁷³ Thomas Thorild (1759-1808), a tumultuous, subjective personality, in whom all the cross currents of the age struggled for mastery, but in whom the romanticist tendency was dominant to such an extent that men like Geijer, Hammar-sköld, and

Atterbom in the next generation considered him almost one of themselves, wrote some free verse which involved him in a notable literary controversy with Kellgren and Leopold; Kellgren and Thorild were already nearer to one another than they realized, even though the former stoutly insisted upon the observance of good form.⁷⁴ An equally tumultuous personality who wrote poetry, whereas Thorild wrote prose, was Bengt Lidner (1757-1793). Lidner enthroned the emotions and passions but ridiculed the man of reason, particularly in *Grefinnan Spartaras Död* (*The Death of the Countess Spartara*, 1783), and his own life fully exemplified this attitude.⁷⁵ Anna Marie Lenngren (1754-1817) goodhumoredly satirized the social foibles of the 1790's and gave expression to her realistic bourgeois philosophy in poetic epigrams, but did not break completely with the classicist style. Two of the best Swedish poets of all time, Franz Michael Franzén and Johan Olof Wallin, began their careers in the last decade of the eighteenth century when they learned the importance of form and structure, but developed into fullfledged romanticists.

The same evolution from classicism toward romanticism occurred in Denmark and Norway. The German poet Klopstock (1724-1803), the first representative of the new national German literature, came to Copenhagen in 1751 upon the invitation of Frederick V and continued there until 1771. Upon Norwegian literature his influence was slight, but the Danes regarded him highly. The Danish poet and dramatist Johannes Ewald (1743-1881) received his first important stimuli from Klopstock, but soon advanced to independent maturity. Endowed with a lyrical spirit, Ewald had grown up in a pietistic environment that had strengthened his emotional character, rendering him peculiarly receptive to the romanticism of Klopstock. Instead of following the abstract, intellectual idealism of his predecessors, he wrote what he had personally experienced, —penetrating psychological self analysis in *Haab og Erindring* (*Hope and Recollection*, 1772), mounting Danish national consciousness in *Balders Död* (*The Death of Balder*, 1775), and an appreciation of common labor in *Fiskerne* (*The Fishermen*).⁷⁶ Upon Jens Baggesen (1764-1826) Johan Herman Wessel, the admirer of French elegance, had placed his own mantle, and Baggesen was not untrue to the trust. He preserved throughout

life a sense of linguistic etiquette, which made even so highly subjective a document as his travel sketch, *Labyrinten* (1789-1790), as neat and cultivated and yet genuine as a Danish landscape. Baggesen accepted wholeheartedly what was true and sincere in romanticism without surrendering his critical capacities, but he paid dearly for his independence after 1800.⁷⁷

In Norway the trend toward sentimentalism and nature worship was best exemplified in Christian Braunman Tullin (1728-1765). Born in Christiania of wealthy parents, he studied in Copenhagen to prepare himself for a position in the church; but frail health necessitated an indoor life, therefore he became a lawyer and a business man in his native city. He read Thomson's *The Seasons*, hated the artificial salon life of Christiania, and developed the intense fervor for nature that so often marks the semi-invalid. Therefore, when he wrote the poem *Majdagen* (*May Day*, 1758) he was not merely imitating Thomson but expressing his innermost self, and with so much artistry that he made himself a permanent place in Norwegian literature.⁷⁸

Sentiment, nature worship, and the Rousseauian simplicity cult—indeed, the whole pre-romanticist tendency—favored the growth of national consciousness in the Scandinavian countries. Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* referred to the northern peoples as the foremost champions of freedom, a remark which was not lost upon his Scandinavian readers, especially the Norwegian historian Gerhard Schöning. Rousseau's enthusiasm for liberty and simplicity made a deep impression upon the intelligentsia, and when he described the sturdy, elemental peasantry of Switzerland his Scandinavian readers conjured up mental images of the equally stout peasants of Sweden and Norway. Rousseau was probably of more direct importance than Herder, but both were widely read and contributed immeasurably to develop a philosophical justification of nationalism. Herder considered the Scandinavians as branches of the Germanic race, and ascribed their vigor and "genius" to the effects of climate. Many a Scandinavian breast swelled with pride at the following passage:

However rude the inhabitants of the northern coasts were long forced to remain, however rough their climate and soil, their accommodations and manner of life,—there was nevertheless hidden in them,

mainly because of their seafaring habits, a germ which in milder environments was quickly capable of shooting beautifully blossoming sprigs. Bravery and vitality, dexterity and skill in all the arts which were later called knightly, a great appreciation of honor and noble descent, together with the well known Nordic respect for the feminine sex as the prize of the bravest, handsomest, and noblest man,—these were qualities which, in the South, were certain to make the Scandinavian sea robbers much beloved.⁷⁹

Herder even attributed the heroism and independence of the English to their Germanic, and especially Norse, ancestry.

It was Herder, furthermore, who taught Europe and the Scandinavian countries to view history genetically, even though Jens Kraft, the Norwegian-Danish scholar, had anticipated him in applying the theory of evolution to history. No more fruitful viewpoint has ever been propounded in the social sciences. History now achieved a new purpose, that of explaining peculiar national characteristics and institutions, and pursued it with such zeal as well nigh to forget that humanity is more than the nation. The Danish Tyge Rothe (1731-1795), building upon the foundations laid by Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Herder, wrote *Nordens Statsforfatning (Scandinavian Constitutional Law, 1782)*, in which he pointed to Norway as the true home of independence and freedom. The Norwegian peasant, he correctly observed, had preserved a degree of social integrity which the Danish had lost. The next year he added his voice to the clamor for agricultural reform, proclaiming it the only means of national regeneration. In Sweden too, the Norwegian peasant was idealized as the pure Nordic type, and Georg Adlersparre used him as a model in his literary efforts to improve the Swedish peasant. And in 1791 Fr. Sneedorff wrote to the Danish national historian Suhm a passage which was filled with the Scandinavian consciousness derived from Herder and Rousseau:

On the 5th of August I was happy; I set foot in Switzerland with the same sentiments as I had when I first landed in Norway. I determined where possible to compare these two countries with one another, the inhabitants of one with those of the other, the political freedom of the Swiss with the civic independence of the Norwegians, and nature in both . . .⁸⁰

Swedish national sentiment also increased. Thanks to Dalin, the patriotic tradition was enriched and continued with-

out interruption from the death of Charles XII to the time when Rousseau's influence could carry it forward.⁸¹ The reaction against the bureaucracy of the *Hats*, which became very apparent toward the close of the Age of Freedom, not only prepared the ground for, but was itself strengthened by, the Rousseauan simplicity ideal. The two earliest Swedish disciples of Rousseau, Gyllenborg and Fischerström, transferred the master's love for the natural and for simple civic virtue to the Swedish past and to the unspoiled rural population. In his *Address to the Swedish People* (*Tal till det Svenska Folket*, 1769), Fischerström glorified the national history and pleaded with his countrymen to recover the morality of the forefathers by steeping themselves in its lore. The mountains, valleys, streams, lakes, and fields of Sweden, he proudly proclaimed, were the natural habitat of a noble race.⁸² The genetic conception of history got its first Swedish representative in Jakob Fredrik Neikter (1744-1803), professor of history and librarian at Upsala. He had read Montesquieu, Rousseau, Herder, and Tyge Rothe, and wrote a treatise on the effect of climate in producing national characteristics, *De Efficacia Climatum ad Variam Gentium Indolem*, 1777-1797. Influenced largely by Neikter's *Undersökning om Orsakerna till Smakens Oliktet, Uppkomst och Fall hos Särskilda Folkslag* (*Studies Concerning the Growth and Decline of Style and its Peculiarities in Different Nationalities*, 1788), Franz Michael Franzén propounded a doctrine of relativism in cultural evolution, particularly with reference to language (*Historiola Orationis Humanae*, 1791-1792). Thus the groundwork was laid for the nationalistic historical school, soon to be founded by Geijer.

The national and romanticist influence of Rousseau and Herder appears also in the virtual rediscovery of Scandinavian mythology and folklore, though the enthusiasm for *Ossian*, emanating from England, was also important. During his residence in Copenhagen, the Swiss P. H. Mallet became interested in Scandinavian mythology and history, which led to the publication of a treatise in the French language in 1756. Partly influenced by Mallet, Herder declared that in the *Edda* and the sagas the Scandinavian countries possessed better sources for the study of their own history and folk-spirit than any other race.⁸³ Klopstock began to use Scandinavian names and themes as

early as 1747. Thomas Percy translated Mallet's *Northern Antiquities* in 1770, and helped to found in England an interest in the Scandinavian past which reacted very favorably upon Scandinavian scholarship. Meanwhile, compilers and historians in those countries were collecting manuscripts and documents, particularly the Danes, Hans Gram, Arne Magnussen, Jacob Langebek, Jens Worm, and P. F. Suhm, the Norwegian Gerhard Schöning, and the Swedes, Olof von Dalin and Sven Lagerbring. They informed the cultivated public of the main stream of Scandinavian history and popularized heroic episodes which might provide themes for nationalistic drama and poetry. But it was not only the heroic past which attracted attention; the contemporary folk life and the beauties of Scandinavian nature were described in many semi-sociological "topographical" studies, and some efforts were made to collect folk tales and folk songs. Thus the peasant and the fisherman came into the purview of literature, signifying the democratization of culture and its national integration.⁸⁴

The poets and dramatists who now began to choose native themes were by no means genuine romanticists; most of them belonged by training and temperament to the Age of Reason, but the growing romanticist tendency broke through this shell with increasing frequency, and its dominant characteristics were love for the nature of the homeland, pride in its national character and history, and a sentimental attachment to the national group. Johannes Ewald wrote historical and social dramas, and Baggesen expressed in *Labyrinten* a passionate devotion to the Danish language.⁸⁵ The Swedish king, Gustav III, won the first grand oratorical prize of the Academy with a memorial address on Lennart Thorstenson, the marshal of the Swedish armies in the Thirty Years' War, and wrote one of the best dramas of the age in *Gustav Vasa*. Leopold enjoyed a triumph with his drama, *Oden eller Asarnes Utvandring* (*Odin, or the Emigration of the Asar*), the content and form of which, however, are more classic than Nordic. Kellgren was also more of a classicist than a patriot, but rendered valuable assistance to Gustav III in the composition of historical dramas. Thomas Thorild, to whom Geijer owed so much, was probably the late eighteenth century Swedish poet and literary critic in whom nationalism was strongest. It marks much of his work, but

stands out with great pathos in *Götmanna-sånger* (*Songs of a Goth*), some of which were written in prison and some in exile, between 1793 and 1806.⁸⁶

Norway had few poets or dramatists of first rank in the eighteenth century, but expressions of the rapidly mounting national feeling were not lacking. The men of the *Norske Selskab* in Copenhagen felt themselves to be different from the Danes and wrote some poetry in the nationalistic vein. Claus Frimann's *Almuens Sanger* (*Songs of the Common People*, 1790), described understandingly the pathos of everyday life in the home country. Johan Nordal Brun's hymn to Norway, *Norge, Kjæmpers Födeland* (1772-1773) was forbidden in Denmark but became a household song in Norway; and his drama *Einar Tambeskjelver* (1772) aroused the Danes to a real fear that the Norwegians might demand independence. Edvard Storm (1749-1794) was not a member of the *Norske Selskab*, but produced a little group of poems, *Døleviser*, after 1769, which were unsurpassed in their simple, genuine nationalism. They were not even written in the conventional Danish-Norwegian, but in the dialect of Gudbrandsdalen.⁸⁷

By 1800 all the elements of literary romanticism were in process of rapid development, and the classicist style was definitely on the defensive.

Thus, at the close of the century, Scandinavian urban culture was essentially identical with that of western Europe and America. It had been deeply imbued with pietism, the direct counterpart of German pietism and Anglo-Saxon Wesleyanism. It had been dominated, like culture in England, France and Germany, by rationalism. And it was keeping step very well with the movement everywhere apparent toward the more complete appreciation of sentimental, emotional, and historical values inherent in romanticism.

To evaluate properly the contributions of the Age of Reason to Scandinavian cultural life would demand a separate volume. It obviously strove for a broader conception of man and his life. The renaissance, also recognizing the dignity of man, tended rather to produce individual supermen than to rehabilitate the lowly and the weak; the renaissance stood for aristocratic humanism,—the Age of Reason for a broad humanitarianism. Therefore the Age of Reason initiated important social and

political movements, though it carried none to completion. It contributed in Scandinavia to a somewhat more intelligent approach to the problem of marriage and divorce, and to a more humane treatment of illegitimate children. A beginning was made toward the improvement of the position of women in society. Much thought devoted to the question of crime and its punishment led to a more lenient attitude toward crimes of poverty and fewer ferocious punishments. The prison reform movement of the late eighteenth century also reached the Scandinavian countries. The problem of the administration of poor relief began to receive much needed attention. Tolerance increased; in 1781 Gustav III of Sweden issued a decree, approved by all the Estates except the clergy, granting the right of worship to other forms of religion than the established Lutheranism. The Age of Reason unquestionably resulted, at least in the earlier stages, in more sincere and honest living. At a later date it became in its turn superficial and thin, but to judge it entirely by its decay is unfair.

Decadent Scandinavian rationalism exhibited almost all the European symptoms. Losing touch, in the last quarter of the century, with the functional realism of the sciences, it dwindled more and more—always excepting a few notable individuals—into a parade of abstractions. Furthermore, it was, after all, the cultural product of the mercantile bourgeoisie, an economic class far narrower than those industrial classes which, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, produced a new rationalism. It was not to be expected that the Age of Reason should rise above its source. Finally, at the close of the century, the economic and intellectual activity which produced rationalism had begun to reach the peasant and lower urban classes, causing them to become articulate. But since they could express themselves, at first, only by the primitive medium of mystic religiosity, not in terms of cultivated reason, their natural folk-mysticism reinforced the still vigorous occultism of the upper classes at the very moment when Hume, Holbach, and Kant led many serious thinkers to doubt the infallibility of pure reason. The passing of Poland warned the Scandinavian countries of the danger confronting their enlightened civilization from the East, and the events of the French Revolution rum-

bled like a dangerously proximate earthquake. A keen sense of witnessing the end of an era rings in the words of the Danish Johannes Boye (1792):

The daylight of the enlightenment has long been illuminating Europe. But may not the darkness of barbarism return? With reluctance do I prophesy evil: but for weapons nothing is impossible. From physical preponderance without enlightenment we have everything to fear . . . Our times are furthermore so highly developed that a catastrophe of great importance to all of Europe can not be far off. The explosion will soon deafen our ears . . . Either enlightenment and happiness must take a hitherto unprecedented stride forward, or we shall make a hideous recession to slavery and stupidity.⁸⁸

CHAPTER V

•

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE ARTS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The courts were the highest protectors and foremost customers of the artists. To paint princes and potentates was the surest way to secure an elite and wealthy group of customers; to give guidance to a queen in her dilettante play with the brush was an occupation which was pursued with finely spun intrigue and which might yield incalculable results, if not in the career of the pupil, then in that of the master; to achieve the title of Court Painter, finally, was to attain the ultimate honor.¹

In Norway the unhappy cleavage had not yet occurred which separates the substantial and tastefully finished handiwork on the one side from art as individual worth or personal confession on the other. It was the conception of art as spiritual value and the theoretical and practical education of the artists at the many newly founded academies of art, which, in the course of the eighteenth century, divorced art and craftsmanship in most countries. In Norway this separation did not occur until the first half of the nineteenth century.²

The fine arts reflected the same economic, social, and political influences that determined the development of Scandinavian thought in the eighteenth century. Art is not separable from life; it is a function of life. But artistic talent and artistic achievements have always been exploited by the dominant social group. In Scandinavia, royalty, the nobility, and the church dominated the arts far into the eighteenth century. Then the bourgeoisie began its career. But the profoundly important difference between the older and the newer dominions was one of economic structure. The kings, the nobles, and the church could command the best talent and supply it with the most appropriate materials. But they did not seriously disturb the organic structure of the old communal rural economy, nor the form of its artistic expression. Only capitalism could do that,—by imposing its basic principles alike upon town and country,

upon upper classes and lower. Peasant art was based on craftsmanship and group effort. When, therefore, the profit motive began to displace that of production for personal use, when the peasant began to trade his product for that of the machine, and when the communal village with its group activities gave way to more individualistic living, the old rural culture inevitably ceded ground to the art forms of the capitalistic economy.

The poverty of the upper classes in Scandinavia prior to the sixteenth century was reflected in their architecture and in the inferior quality of their painting, sculpture, and music. The church, before the reformation, had erected some notable cathedrals, already old when Lutheranism replaced Catholicism. Renaissance art, which came late to the far north, profoundly influenced the restricted circle wealthy enough to follow it; upon such cities as Copenhagen and Stockholm it placed an indelible stamp. No less than seven distinct waves of Italian renaissance styles have been distinguished in Sweden.³ In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the royalty and nobility of Scandinavia constructed a number of imposing palaces and manors which testify to their power. But from their own midst these classes produced few artists; the architects, musicians, sculptors, and painters who served them were almost always foreigners. In consequence their art was either frankly alien, or only half assimilated.

The value of urban art was as small as the scope of urban activities. The towns were too small and too poor to develop their own art forms. On the other hand, they were effectively cut off from the more vital artistic life of the rural population by their different economic and social interests, differences which in both practice and legislation often became active conflict. The town population sneered at peasant art, but had not learned how to give artistic expression to its own life. A distinctively urban culture only developed in the second half of the eighteenth century. What there was in the towns of comfort, refinement, and art was more feudal and upper-class than bourgeois. The exceptions proved the rule; only the richest burghers of Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Bergen could vie with the titled aristocracy, to whose arbitraments in matters of elegance they obsequiously deferred.

The most genuine artistic expression prior to the eighteenth

century was to be found among neither the bourgeoisie nor the hereditary aristocracy, but in the homes and festivals of the peasantry. It was spontaneous, functional, and well adapted to communal rural society. Music was no individual triumphal achievement, either in composition or performance, but a natural accompaniment to social activity in the folk song or the folk dance. The concept of ownership in artistic production was completely absent. The authors of ballads and folk tales were seldom known, and their works belonged to any group capable of appreciating their varied moods and emotions. Neither music, nor ballads, nor folktales were communicated in written symbols, but by word of mouth and usually in groups. Architecture was fundamentally functional; but the ornamental features, ranging from the grotesque to the stately, often revealed the personalities of builders and occupants. What there was of peasant painting was primarily protective coverage for interior walls and furnishings, but the primitive decorative instinct manifested itself in design and pattern. In sculpture, usually wood carving applied to tools and household utensils, the individual craftsman's personality and even the group culture was expressed in the immediate material environment. This rural art was the product of a relatively static society. Its basic forms were the same throughout all of Scandinavia and far beyond its borders. But as the topographical obstacles and political boundaries served to decentralize national language into regional dialects, they operated similarly in developing regional artistic patterns, designs, and motifs. Peasant art was thus organic with the life from which it emanated.

But Scandinavian rural society was never completely isolated from exterior impulses. It was merely so stable internally that it could assimilate the new without suffering disintegration. Changes in architecture occurred, for example the introduction of the chimney, a second story to the house, and glass windows; but they were due to no revolution in the basic social fabric. The Lutheran emphasis upon hymn singing vastly enriched the music of the countryside, but, until the popular religious movements of the early nineteenth century, without prejudice to the folk song or the folk dance. The century prior to the transformation of agriculture for sustenance into agricul-

ture for profit was richer in peasant art than any other. The economic and social basis remained essentially the same as before, thus dictating an organic development of earlier art forms. But simultaneously the cultural tide waters of the mercantile world were backing farther than ever up into the rural districts, where they produced combinations and variations of unusual beauty.

The eighteenth century brought Scandinavian peasant art to its culmination and laid the foundations for a cosmopolitan upper class art characteristic of the new bourgeois civilization. The fundamental differences between these two kinds of art require separate consideration; and because the art of the courts and towns had an important influence upon that of the peasantry, the former should be discussed first.

Upper class art was determined by many important factors, of which the most pervasive may conveniently be termed socio-economic. All art exists and grows upon some economic basis, and the distribution of economic power creates social classes able, in proportion to their means, to command the services of artistic talent and provide good materials. Since the Scandinavian royalty possessed the largest economic resources throughout most of the eighteenth century, the courts naturally exerted a preponderant influence upon artistic development. In the first part of the century, at any rate, almost all Scandinavian upper class art depended on the construction and decoration of royal palaces. This situation carried over from the latter half of the seventeenth century, and resulted naturally from the victory of absolutism, by which kings acquired both the motive and the means to monumentalize their grandeur. Second only to royalty as patrons of art were the nobility, who, in spite of their subordination under absolutism, or perhaps for that very reason, proved their culture by building relatively expensive houses in town and country. Throughout the whole century, however, and with rapidly increasing taste and wealth, the bourgeoisie disputed the patronage of art with royalty and nobility. The capitalists, furthermore, showed greater independence in directing the course of artistic development, for they had more practical interests to serve, both in their homes and in their business establishments. They exercised, together with their close allies the bureaucracy, an entirely

disproportionate influence in Norway, where there was no royalty and practically no nobility, and where their class imprint virtually fixed the national art forms.⁴

The all-embracing mercantilistic economic system did not ignore art. The fact that Swedish absolutism ended in 1719 did not greatly affect the history of Swedish art for the *riksdag* assumed the king's function as its patron, and in 1727 decreed that work on the Royal Palace in Stockholm be resumed. Furthermore, to obviate dependence upon foreign artists and the importation of foreign, especially French, works of art, the *riksdag* in 1735 established the Royal Academy of Draughtsmanship. In Denmark and Norway also mercantilism helped to shape artistic development. The Danish Academy of Arts was founded in 1756 for the same reasons as in Sweden. And in all three countries several of the industries called into being and subsidized by the state,—especially mines, glass industries, and fayence industries—employed and trained artistic talent. In Norway, for example, a large number of architects, sculptors, and painters were employed or trained in either the War College established at Oslo in 1751 or the School of Mines organized in connection with the Kongsberg silver mine in 1757. Many of them combined independent artistic production with their industrial or military work, but some made art their only vocation. The art schools and art industries fostered by mercantilism were, of course, by that same economic theory directed to observe the fluctuating European fashions, which set the demands of both the domestic and world market. In determining the special national styles to be followed, however, such as French or English rococco, political and economic relations played a great role. Sweden, for instance, took more from her political ally France than from any other country, whereas Norway followed England most closely because of important commercial connections.

The economic conditions which shaped upper-class art thus also colored the artist's attitude toward his work with a distinctly modern professional spirit. Formerly there was no great distinction between the arts and the crafts; the humdrum of daily work went hand in hand with the thrill of artistic self expression. This was true for Sweden and Denmark in the seventeenth and in the first decades of the eighteenth centuries,

for Norway throughout the whole eighteenth century. Now, however, the arts were separating from the crafts; the arts became professionalized, partly in consequence of the artist's relationship to his patron. Instead of being the expression of group life through the medium of the artist, art now became the expression of merely two individual tastes, with the probability, however, that both these tastes reached beyond the provincial to a national, even a cosmopolitan, character. The artist became a virtuoso, separated by his expertness from the immediate group influence. Even more conducive to professionalism than the patron relationship were the newly established art schools and exhibitions. Here the artist was on the one hand freed by acquiring the best techniques, and on the other disciplined by exposure to the supreme achievements of cosmopolitan art. The founding of art schools in Scandinavia has already been noted; public art exhibits began shortly afterwards,—the first annual exhibition of the Danish Academy of Arts was held in 1769. What was happening in Scandinavian urban art was after all what was also happening in economic life, social affairs, thought, and politics,—the local and provincial was being merged in a higher synthesis of national and Western European civilization, a process which under then existing circumstances afforded greater opportunities to individual initiative and enterprise.

The triumph of the professional spirit represented both gain and loss. It was a serious loss when these professionals assumed the right to determine the canons of art, for no sooner was this successfully accomplished than they haughtily rejected the relatively crude and naive work of the lower classes. In consequence those classes themselves, who are the great body of the population, in humility and discouragement laid their own art aside, thereafter inadequately satisfying their hunger for beauty by wretched copies of upper-class art—originals they could never afford,—or by extremely rare visits to art galleries. Thus to have deprived most of society of its right to artistic self expression, to have taken away from it much of its spontaneously developed culture, is a serious indictment of the professional art evolved by the upper classes. It may even be questioned whether the artists who served them gained as much as they lost. It is a rare artist who can afford to cultivate beauty

for its own sake; even the peasant artist must ordinarily satisfy his customer. But the restraints imposed by the mass taste to which the peasant customer almost invariably subscribes is a very different thing from the vitiating tyranny of the powerful patron who demands flattery. More than one artist, in Scandinavia and throughout the world, has prostituted himself for a living. If at the same time he has been sensitive and conscientious, he has broken his heart.

It is obvious that this chase for princely favor must cause a servility in attitude, which is highly repulsive and inartistic to the modern viewpoint. But we must remember that the artist often had to choose between becoming the golden-chained lackey of the elite or a despised artisan.⁵

When the market for art was enlarged by the bidding of the bourgeoisie some of the worst features of the patronage system disappeared. There is another tyranny, however, to which the professionalized artist has been subject, a tyranny often as suffocating as that of the patron, namely the overweening domination exercised by the professional aristocracy assembled in the training centers and in Academies of Art. These institutions naturally pronounced "expert" judgments respected by the lay world, and since they have generally been controlled by men of older and established views they have frequently resented new and unconventional forms of expression. On the other hand, professionalism contributed immeasurably to elevate standards and techniques; hence, as art gradually was democratized again it maintained a higher level. Furthermore, the nineteenth and twentieth century artist felt a greater individual responsibility; art became an expression of personal faith.

Eighteenth century Scandinavian art followed closely the successive European styles. Since the Great Northern War left neither time nor money for the finer arts, the year 1720 may be said to open an epoch also in this field. The baroque, which lasted until about 1750, was a stately, dignified style, with a passion for symmetrical plan well suited to the period of confident absolutism and state-centered economy. Its decoration was warmly joyous, but moderate. The rococo, which dominated the period from 1750 to about 1785, resembled the clothing, the coiffures, the manners, and the literature of the time. It was marked by excessively ornate decoration, by an intellec-

tual confusion which it pathetically attempted to conceal by an almost hysterical formalism, by a groundless optimism expressing itself in bright fabrics, gold and blue paint, and exhibitionistic architectural details; it manifested a narcissistic fondness for mirrors, and affected a virtue which did not exist. It was the art of a decaying aristocratic culture. In reaction against it two widely divergent styles appeared, the neo-classical, which began as *Louis Seize* but culminated in *l'empire*, and the romantic. Neo-classicism looked backward for its patterns, first to Rome and the stimulating recent excavations at Pompei and then to ancient Greece, whose pre-eminence in art was being proclaimed by travellers and by the German critic Winckelmann. Both Roman and Greek art were severe and restrained, the Roman sturdily solid, Greek art more light of touch and true to nature. Romanticism, peculiarly English and Germanic, drew inspiration from nature and homely bourgeois life. Broadly speaking, the Scandinavian countries experienced only the general aspects of these styles and missed many of the transitional nuances and variations. And in adapting them Sweden, Norway, and Denmark gave to each style their own peculiar national stamp. During the first decades, most of the artists who practiced in Scandinavia were foreigners, mostly French and German, and throughout the whole century a constantly diminishing number were of foreign birth. Their presence accounted in no small measure for the smoothness with which Scandinavian art kept pace with the evolution of European fashions.

Scandinavian architecture achieved eminent heights. In Sweden the building of the Royal Palace was resumed in 1728. This truly monumental building will always be remembered as the work of the Tessin family, Nicodemus Jr. (1654-1729) and his son Karl Gustaf (1695-1770). The father drew the plans and began the construction, which was interrupted between 1707 and 1728; and the son carried it forward to completion after 1729. The exterior is late Italian renaissance style, of which it is a classic example, but the interior reflects baroque and rococo. Other notable buildings were erected at Stockholm for the nobility and the bourgeoisie, one of the best baroque structures being *Riddarhuset* (Hall of the Nobility). Denmark received the baroque style some forty years before

Sweden, via Holland, and applied it in the same building material as the late renaissance, the pliable, softly colored brick. Ulrik Frederik Gyldenløve's palace in Copenhagen (1672), the present Charlottenborg, was one of the first baroque structures in Denmark. Immediately before the Great Northern War, the Swedish architect, Nicodemus Tessin, Jr., exercised considerable influence in Denmark, and through a pupil even in Bergen, Norway, but the war terminated that by temporarily interrupting all building activities. They were resumed, however, with increased vigor by the spendthrift kings, Christian VI and Frederick V, under the leadership of the architects, E. D. Häusser, Laurids Thurah, and Nic. Eigtved in constructing the Christiansborg and Hirschholm palaces and the little hunting lodge, Hermitage. The rich Danish landlords also engaged the services of these men to erect such noble baroque types as the present Odd-Fellow House in Copenhagen and the beautiful complex of houses which now constitute the royal palace of Amalienborg. In all three countries the bourgeoisie, increasingly wealthy and independent, followed the prevailing styles. In Norway, especially, where neither a court, nor a nobility, nor great public offices overshadowed them, the merchants and landlords placed upon architecture their stamp of homely comfort and confident solidity. There, and to a lesser extent in Sweden and Denmark, architecture was so far democratized that, besides the army officers and mining engineers who possessed good theoretical knowledge, many of the burghers themselves were able to draw plans and supervise construction. The absence of professionalism in Norwegian architecture permitted the various styles, baroque, rococco, and neo-classical, to merge insensibly in a bourgeois architecture of distinctly national character, which was one of the great cultural achievements of the age. Rococco exercised comparatively little influence upon the exteriors of Scandinavian buildings, although its effect was evident in the miniature Chinese palaces in Stockholm and Copenhagen. In 1783, Gustav III brought back from his Italian travels the neo-classical style, already represented in Denmark by the French architect N. H. Jardin (1720-1799) and his Danish pupil C. F. Harsdorff (1735-1799). The romantic influence became evident, toward the close of the century, particularly in the preference for informal,

naturalistic, so-called "English" gardens over the formerly popular formal French baroque gardens. Viewed as a whole, Scandinavian architecture in this period enjoyed a pre-eminence theretofore never achieved, and since only in the twentieth century."

Sculpture, throughout most of the eighteenth century, remained closely associated with architecture. At first it merely supplied decoration for the palaces and churches, but grew more independent after 1750. The splendid altarpiece in the Church of Our Savior in Copenhagen was executed by J. C. Krieger from Tessin's drawings. In Sweden the two French sculptors, Jacques Philip Bouchardon and Pierre Larchevêque, were engaged to help decorate the Royal Palace; both represented the transition from baroque to rococco. Another Frenchman, J. F. J. Saly (1717-1776), represents this trend in Copenhagen, where he did the splendid, but fantastically expensive equestrian statue of the mediocre Frederick V, which stands in the square at Amalienborg Palace. Baroque sculpture consisted largely of ornamental floral carvings, usually the south European acanthus vine; the rococco elaborated it by adding flowers, heads of cupids and angels, and other mythological subjects. When human figures were modelled, the arrangement and fall of the robes were regarded more important than the representation of personality. Thus emphasis upon technique, or virtuosity, and indifference to subject matter culminated in an essentially false and unnatural sculpture, against which neo-classicism arose as a wholesome corrective.

Johannes Wiedewelt, the pupil of Saly, the friend of Winckelmann, and the tutor of Thorvaldsen, did some good work in the neo-classical style; but it was the Swede, Johan Tobias Sergel (1740-1814), who first carried this style to real eminence in sculpture. Sergel studied with Larchevêque and was granted a public stipend for a long residence in Rome, where he steeped himself in classical art and soon became known as the best sculptor in the city. Beginning with *The Faun* (1770), he produced one marble statue after the other in a classical style unequalled by preceding moderns. His works were avidly purchased by French and English connoisseurs; the original *Diomedes* was taken by Lord Talbot and the second by Gustav III. *Amor and Psyche* became and has

remained the most popular of his works. Sergel, called back to Sweden in 1778 to take the place of Larchevêque at the Royal Palace, regretfully obeyed. Although he afterwards produced some excellent pieces, his inspiration suffered by removal from the superb models of antiquity to a country which was poor, not only in cosmopolitan art, but in the means to support culture. After his return to Sweden, he was rarely able to work in marble, and his art reflected his frustration. His best work in this period is undoubtedly the superb statue of Gustav III, whom he considered his own personal king. "There is at one and the same time something of the victorious hero, an Apollo, and a theatre king in this figure, which for that reason is 'Gustavian to the life'."⁷ It was impossible for Sergel to think in any but classical terms; the Christ in his *Resurrection* is really an Apollo, by no means "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." After the assassination of Gustav III, in the penurious, troubled period between 1792 and 1814, Sergel found it almost impossible to work. His reputation as the most eminent sculptor his nation has ever presented to the world is based chiefly on what he did at Rome.

Sergel first demonstrated to the world the splendid possibilities of neo-classicist sculpture, but the Dane Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770-1844) became the great master. Thorvaldsen was born in poverty, studied at the Academy of Arts and won the prize travelling fellowship. From 1797 to 1838 he lived in Rome constantly, except for a brief period. In 1805, his *Jason*, returning victoriously with the golden fleece on his arm, won international fame. Thorvaldsen was a more serious and thoughtful artist than Sergel; therefore his *Christ*, though a type of perfect physical manhood, is infused with religious feeling. Thorvaldsen's marbles are marked by an Olympian chastity, expressive of a high idealism but certainly not of human reality. Georg Brandes is supposed to have remarked about Thorvaldsen's *Night*, that it was not the night of mortal experience, in which men make love and commit murder. But this is precisely why, together with his great technical skill, Thorvaldsen is generally regarded, not only as little Denmark's great sculptor, but as the finest sculptor of the neo-classicist style.⁸

Norway had no professional sculptors in the eighteenth cen-

tury. There were, however, many wood carvers, usually craftsmen, who festooned pulpits, altars, cupboards, tables, and chairs with garlands of acanthus vine, grape vine, flowers, heads and busts. Some garden statuettes were imported by the wealthy merchants and landlords, and more were crudely carved by amateur artists in wood and sandstone. In the booming shipyards of all three countries hundreds of mermaids, Neptunes, and admirals were chiseled from oaken timbers to dip with the waves as ships' figureheads, and most numerous in prosperous Norway. Formal sculpture in the nobler materials did not thrive. The bourgeoisie were too frugal to support this expensive art.⁹

Painting, the most sensitive and probably the least expensive of the arts, continued its development from the past, but now laid its modern foundations. Like upper class sculpture, painting was at first a craftsman's skill wedded to architectural decoration. Although Swedish and Danish painting became professional early in the eighteenth century, there were at least two good reasons why the baroque figured less in painting than the rococco: there were few painters, as none of the arts had progressed very far before 1720; and the rococco set more store by painting than the baroque. The types of painting preferred by the rococco were portraiture and the society scene, which both reflected, almost as well as the many mirrors, the egocentricity and cultivated optimism and over-cultivated manners of the time.

Three Swedish and one Danish painter won international renown in the rococco period, but they belong almost more to the countries in which they worked than to those of their birth. Gustaf Lundberg (1695-1786) and Alexander Roslin (1718-1793) left Sweden for Paris, where they advanced to become members of the French Academy. Lundberg returned in 1745 to become court painter. His favorite subject was the frivolous youth of the age, whereas Roslin painted portraits of great realism. Carl Gustaf Pilo (1711-1793) was born in Sweden, but spent a large part of his life in Copenhagen, where he did no less than fifty-seven portraits of Frederick V and in 1771 was made director of the Academy of Arts. In old age he returned to Sweden, where he painted one of his masterpieces, the *Coronation of Gustav III*, interesting because it

placed the Third Estate in a very prominent position. The Danish Vigilius Erichsen (1722-1782), one of the first graduates of the Academy of Arts, executed cool and polite portraits as court painter to Catherine the Great and later to the Danish queen dowager, Juliane Marie.¹⁰

The painters who remained at home combined international styles with more homely, national characteristics. Niclas Lafrensen (1737-1807) painted the elegant society of Sweden with great fidelity; Lorenz Pasch, Jr. (1733-1805) and Per Hilleström (1733-1816) found their favorite subjects among the bourgeoisie. Only one painter in Norway may be classified as truly representing the upper class rococco, namely the German-born Heinrich C. F. Hosenfelder (ca. 1722-ca. 1801). He was an excellent artist, for a time employed by the Herrebø fayence factory, who supported himself when the factory closed by painting the Norwegian bourgeoisie; but until recently his work has been almost entirely overlooked.¹¹

Scandinavian painting was reasonably quick to reflect the reaction against the artificiality of the rococco. The growing importance of the bourgeoisie introduced more wholesome tastes and interests, for this group demanded artistic recognition of practical people and practical affairs. Furthermore, their vanity sought other forms of satisfaction than pictorial flattery. Neo-classicism, in its earlier stages at least, was another form in which painting mirrored the flight from extravagance toward simplicity. Scandinavian painters learned this style from the great French master David. Finally, there was the rapidly mounting national consciousness which usually combined with incipient Rousseauan and English romanticism to idealize the landscape. These were the three rivulets which, though mainly separate until the close of the eighteenth century, united thereafter to form the full-bodied stream of romanticism.

The Swedes, Pasch and Hilleström, typified the bourgeois trend, as did also Jens Juel in Denmark and practically all the Norwegian painters. These men did portraits, as well as scenes from the home and from business life, in much the same spirit as the old Dutch masters, quiet in tone, true to fact, and often with considerable psychological insight. They revealed a dignity in their subjects, a self assurance, which compared with

aristocratic foppishness, announced more plainly than words that a new social order was maturing. The French and Italian neo-classicist influence found able followers in the Swedes, Louis Adrien Masreliez (1747-1810) and Adolf Ulrik Wertmüller (1751-1811), who had both studied under David. Wertmüller painted a masterpiece of Marie Antoinette and her children; and his romantic admiration for America caused him to visit this country twice. The first time he painted a portrait of George Washington, and on the second visit he fell ill and died. In Denmark the neo-classical tendency, most especially its Italian phase, found a splendid exponent in N. A. Abildgaard (1743-1809), who furthermore occupied a dominant position at the Academy of Arts. Besides being a painter, Abildgaard was an architect and a sculptor. The incipient romantic love of nature came to Scandinavian painting chiefly via England. The notable Danish painter, Jens Juel (1745-1802), was influenced most particularly by Gainsborough. His landscapes are surcharged with atmosphere, and his portraits by a deep sincerity. The two Swedish masters, Carl Fredrik von Breda (1759-1818) and Elias Martin (1739-1818), both studied in England, the former with Sir Joshua Reynolds and Gainsborough, the latter with Richard Wilson and Gainsborough. Martin was even admitted to the Royal Academy in London. Both excelled in painting Swedish landscapes, and followed the practice of the English school in placing their portraits against a natural background. Norway still lagged behind the other countries in professionalized painting, though Johan Georg Müller (1771-1822) did some fairly good landscapes, and was at the turn of the century giving instruction to young J. C. C. Dahl, who was soon to win international renown for his paintings of Norwegian nature. It is interesting to note that foreigners in a sense discovered Norway's stupendous scenery before the native artists did. In 1788 and 1790, respectively, the Danish painters, Erik Pauelsen and Christian Aug. Lorentzen, travelled there; the pictures that they painted were duplicated in copper engravings and spread all over Europe, to the great advantage of the tourist traffic. Nevertheless, Norwegian painting was passing through a most important stage of its development at the end of the eighteenth century, namely the transformation from the craft to the pro-

fessional basis. Soon after the re-establishment of Norwegian independence in 1814, Norwegian painters began to compete successfully with the representatives of the more advanced countries.¹²

Certain branches of industry gave employment to artists and reflected in their products the great European styles. The goldsmith's trade was well advanced in all three countries; it showed the effects, not only of the tastes of the wealthy, but of the peasantry, for throughout all Scandinavia in this century they were investing part of their surplus capital in silver goblets and plate. Since there were no banks of deposit, such investment constituted their method of saving. A considerable amount of furniture was imported from abroad, but Scandinavian cabinet makers were quick to copy their patterns. The Chinese influence and that of Chippendale were predominant in Norway and Denmark, while Sweden inclined more toward the French patterns of Marot and Berain. The fayence industry used both sculptors and painters. The Royal Porcelain Factory in Copenhagen and the Herrebö factory in Norway attained for a short time to equality with the best in Europe. The Norwegian glass factory at Nöstetangen was the only one in Scandinavia which produced art glass of first quality. In Norway, furthermore, the stove industry employed many carvers to fashion molds for the plates. These molds were so carved as to bring out upon the iron plate some design in relief, and after two hundred years of activity on a considerable market—stoves were sold in Denmark and Germany as well as at home—the industry had become very sensitive to styles in design. The carvers developed no little skill and almost every cultural trend was reflected on the stoves. Pietism brought an interest in religious motifs; the baroque, the rococo, neo-classicism, *Louis Seize* and *l'empire* were all represented; and dawning romanticism was brought into evidence by scenes from the daily life of the peasantry, the miners, the timber workers, and the bourgeoisie.¹³

Music experienced a similar history. Prior to 1720 almost the only formal music was found at the royal courts, where court musicians were retained. The musicians were mainly foreigners and there was practically no native composition. J. H. Roman, who returned to Sweden in 1720, after four years of

study in England, was an exception. Some cantatas, oratorios, and operas were performed even before 1720. In the eighteenth century pietism served the cause of music well, though the emphasis upon the cantata, the oratorio, and hymnology was excessive. When its influence waned somewhat, secular concerts became common and popular, attracting even the women. Ludvig Holberg was passionately devoted to music, and a highly interested member of the Musical Society founded in Copenhagen in 1744. In the second half of the century opera flourished; Gustav III erected the famous Opera House in Stockholm, which remained the great center of this form of music until his narrow minded son, Gustav IV Adolf, closed it. The professionalization of music and the systematic education of native artists began in Sweden in 1771; music was then placed under royal protection with the founding of the Royal Academy of Music. Three years later a similar institution was founded in Copenhagen. The spirit of the age of aristocratic salons found expression in chamber music; and the rationalistic way of life, translated into music, demanded formalism and technical precision. The music of the period was as delicate and fragile and graceful, but also as lacking in depth of emotion, as other rococo art. Some of it degenerated to mere foppishness. During the last quarter of the century, when the club fad penetrated even the lower middle class, a music evolved which, if not the acme of formal art, at any rate expressed simpler and more genuine living. Its range included lyrical love songs, pieces composed for every sort of special occasion, and bawdy drinking ditties. At the end of the century music was so much more popular that every respectable club set aside at least one evening in the week for a concert, and a dilettante skill at the spinet was an educational *sine qua non* of the bourgeois and the aristocratic female alike.¹⁴

Economic conditions determined the evolution of art among the peasantry, as well as the urban classes. It has already been noted to what extent and in what manner the Scandinavian rural economy was altered in the eighteenth century.¹⁵ Until the great reforms, beginning in 1784, the Danish peasants were bound to the soil which they cultivated mainly as tenants. Under such circumstances it was not to be expected that they would beautify their homes; therefore Danish rural art flour-

ished only moderately. And when the reforms occurred urban fashions in clothing and ornamentation began to be adopted almost at once, with the result that traditional peasant art speedily declined. In Sweden, on the contrary, the old social pattern was preserved far into the nineteenth century, and yet steady improvement of rural economy was achieved; therefore the art of that group showed gradual improvement until about 1840, when capitalistic agriculture caused the traditional mode of life and of art to be discarded. It was in Norway that a fortunate combination of circumstances produced the most marked development in artistic sense and expression during the eighteenth century. Here individual ownership of land was greatly extended, enabling the peasant to profit from the better grain prices, and here the extraordinary prosperity of the timber industry redounded at least somewhat to the advantage of the peasant, for, though exposed to exploitation by the rich, he could often sell timber at some profit and find remunerative employment in the forests or in hauling. The building of roads enlivened trade and placed the rural population into closer contact with urban life, thus stimulating a desire for better things without abruptly disrupting the traditional rural fabric. Furthermore there was not, in Norway, any royal court or any powerful nobility to sharply accentuate the cleavage between the artistic expression of the upper and lower classes.

The absence of any such chasm was very important to the happy growth of Norwegian peasant art, for it meant that not even upper-class art was highly professionalized. Thus it was far easier for the Norwegian peasant, than for his Swedish or Danish brother, to imitate the higher forms. Art had not yet begun to be a hopeless mystery. It was true in all three countries, of course, that new goals were set for the peasant artist by the wealthier classes and institutions. To the home of some office holder or the castle of some nobleman many commoners were admitted at least once in a lifetime; folk literature and folk art bear many evidences of the impressions of grandeur there received. And with the church, always more rich in its appointments than any peasant's home, the lives of all were intimately associated. From these wells of a higher culture the peasant had always dipped. Common to the folk art of all three countries was its non-professional spirit. The artist

seldom retained any artistic ownership in his own product, which is clearly proved by the fact that it was almost never signed; only toward the close of the eighteenth century, when the professional attitude was beginning to reach also the countryside, did signatures become common. This does not mean, of course, that rural artists preserved total anonymity, for they were engaged like other artists largely upon their reputations. But their fame was almost entirely local or provincial, built up in private conversation between neighbor and neighbor. Their work, furthermore, was so intimately joined to decoration, either of church or home, and therefore so rarely saleable in any kind of art market, that it was almost impossible for the artists to retain any semblance of property interest. Every good piece of work, however, fetched its maker new orders, as in the towns and at court. It was another common characteristic of peasant art that its representatives had seldom enjoyed academic training. There was a close relationship between the arts and the crafts; painters of portraits, pictures, and decorations, for example, were usually members of the house-painters' guild. In any case, it was very rare that the artist made a living entirely by his art; he might be a rural craftsman but more often he depended upon the soil for most of his sustenance, and in either case his art merely supplied some additional income. Skills were often passed from father to son, as in the guilds.

It must be evident, therefore, that the rural artists were far less tyrannized by style than the professionals who served the upper classes. It was far easier to please the unsophisticated peasant customer, and there was no high court of experts to pass judgment. Consequently the rural artist could exercise more freedom of imagination, even though technical standards were lower. Since the peasant's sphere of activity was national-provincial, and since he was but fleetingly exposed to the grand styles, he was ordinarily very independent in what he borrowed from them. On the other hand, what had once been assimilated was tenaciously retained in this relatively static society. In the countryside of all the three nations it was possible throughout the eighteenth century to find still in full function all the main art trends to which there had been exposure, from the primitive pagan age to that of the rococo. The renaissance

style, for example, was found very suitable for some types of furniture such as tables and cupboards; therefore they were generally retained, and when the rococco demanded that they be brightly decorated the paint was applied directly. It was this independence in the adaptations of the grand styles, which imparted to peasant art its peculiarly national and provincial character.

Truly rural architecture reflected the passing scene of the eighteenth century less directly than sculpture and painting. Most building was modest, following the old, established national styles with but minor modifications. Agriculture is a proverbially conservative occupation, and those who follow it on a small scale have always been compelled to practice frugality. For them any new house becomes expensive. Furthermore, houses that differ radically from those to which their occupants are accustomed may occasion an agony of readjustment. Then, too, the builder would at this period almost always be the peasant himself or one of his neighbors, neither of whom had sufficient theoretical schooling to master the upper class styles. Consequently new ideas were likely to find expression only in such details as the arrangement of windows, the installation of planed boards on interior walls—occasionally panelled—, doorways, porticoes, and fan-windows, very similar to those of eighteenth century colonial America. A few of the most fortunately situated yeomen engaged semi-trained architects from a nearby town or army barracks, in which cases the architectural styles might very nearly approximate those of the bourgeoisie.¹⁰ But extensive rebuilding of farm homes and buildings did not occur until the second half of the nineteenth century.

Peasants, of course, could not afford what is usually understood by sculpture. Not only were the materials too expensive, but motives were lacking. The plastic arts were therefore confined almost entirely to wood carvings, though much of the church sculpture and the molds for stove plates may be considered to be of peasant origin. Wood carving was certainly the oldest rural art, after a very primitive architecture, with which it had always been intimately associated. In the eighteenth century wood carving was applied with particular fondness to furniture, doorways, and such utensils as bowls, mangle-

boards, distaffs, candle sticks, trays, chests, and swingles for cleaning flax. Motifs were highly varied, including the ancient Scandinavian, Gothic, baroque, and rococco, with the last two occupying the prominent places. The baroque influence is discernible in a restrained floral design, usually the acanthus, whereas the rococco exhibited here, as everywhere, its penchant for a-symmetry and luxuriance. Typical of the rococco wood carving of Sweden and Norway is the floral pattern in acanthus or grape vine or both, with roses, clusters of grapes, and more rarely the face of a child or cherub. Practically no human figures were carved. A very notable exception, however, was the Norwegian Christensen Garnaas (1723-1804?), who first carved some thirty wooden statuettes illustrative of the peasant life that he knew. During a sojourn in Copenhagen, 1764-1771, he was engaged by Frederick V, who had seen some of his wooden pieces, to carve a larger series in ivory. Besides being valuable as illustrations of costume, for they are highly realistic, they are notable as definite, though unconscious, precursors of the romanticist interest in the humble and the primitive. Garnaas' statuettes were used by the Danish-German sculptor, Joh. Gottfr. Grund, in the 1790's, as models for the sandstone statues for *Nordmandsdalen* (The Valley of the Norsemen) in the Fredensborg castle gardens. The Royal Danish Porcelain Factory also copied them in miniatures which became very popular.¹⁷

Never, before or since, has the Scandinavian peasantry expressed itself in painting as in the eighteenth century. During the middle ages a rich though naive painters' art had flourished in the churches, but it terminated with the reformation and was resumed only in the early sixteenth century. The peasantry must have been tempted to transfer some of this beauty to their own homes, but the respect in which the house of God was held militated against it. Upon the resumption of church painting, however, at a time when religion had been somewhat democratized and particularly when secular interests were breaking down the earlier veneration for the holy place, the peasants began in Sweden to follow the pastors in decorating their homes with paintings. Probably the church was something of an influence in causing the peasants of Norway and Denmark also to adopt painting, but there are indications that

secular factors were there more important. In Norway, as a matter of fact, even the churches were painted in the eighteenth century with baroque and rococo secular motifs.

As already indicated, rural painting in Denmark fell considerably behind that of Sweden and Norway; it consisted there mainly of simple floral designs applied almost only to utensils. In Sweden its development centered chiefly about the two provinces of Småland and Dalarne, and reveals greater naïveté than in Norway. Besides the usual designs on the surfaces of household utensils, the Swedish peasantry demonstrated a partiality for pictorial painting on paper, cloth, and leather, probably in imitation of the gobelin tapestries of the nobility. Such paintings usually fetched the artist a price of three to five *kronor* (one *krona* being equal to about twenty-six cents)—few customers could pay more—; therefore the painter skimped on the quality of materials and exercised much less care, than in the better rewarded paintings for the churches. The paintings which the Swedish peasants put up in their homes usually illustrated some text from the Bible, folk tales, ballads, or sagas; frequently they would depict some particular aspect of folk life; sometimes they revealed a keen sense of the comic; but allegorical and historical themes were rare. A painting from Floda, executed in 1843, is entitled, "The Steamboat Which Sails on Lake Siljan in Dalarne." But with the coming of the steamboat and the railway the isolation of the peasantry was broken down, and with it disappeared the art of peasant painting. Some *måleböcker* (painters' books) are preserved, which help to reveal how this art was carried on; they contained notes to serve the painter as guides, texts suitable for themes, and miniature samples from which customers could make orders if they had nothing special that they desired the painter to do. The painter might take special orders, but more often he would paint at home and offer his wares for sale at the market.

Swedish peasant paintings were usually very naive; thus King David and Bathsheba, Roman centurions at the crucifixion, and characters from folk life were dressed in the contemporary provincial costume. A sense of historical and pictorial perspective was usually absent. This throws into bold relief the most salient feature of peasant culture under the old

regime, namely the tightness of its fabric. Details from other cultures might be taken up, but either they were so completely assimilated that they were clad in the very costume of the neighborhood, or they were as yet so completely unassimilated that they were painted into any open space on the picture entirely without relation to the rest. A Swedish rural painting on the theme of David's seduction of Bathsheba, done in Rätvik in 1834, shows David in the uniform of King Charles John, a pump in the shape of a neo-classical column, and rococco floral decorations painted into the blank space of the sky. In other words, the biblical tale had become a permanent piece in the intellectual inventory, whereas the rococco was merely in the process of being accepted. The Swedish poet, Erik Axel Karlfeldt, has written a series of poems, which are remarkable for the precision with which they have caught the spirit of peasant painting; they are called *Dalmålningar på rim* (Paintings from Dalarne in Rhyme). A translation of *Eliæ himmelsfärd* (The Ascent of Elijah to Heaven) appears below:¹⁸

Thus journeys St. Elijah to the Heavenly land
In a gig new and glistening to see.
He wears a tall silk hat, a fur coat, has a horsewhip in his hand,
And a large green umbrella at his knee.

Rapt and dignified his bearing, for he journeys from this vale
To the high seat in the great hall of his King.
He was summoned by the Master: "Thou shalt sit within the pale
As a member of my just and righteous *Ting*."

And the King himself dispatched his own carriage and his steed,
And this message: "Hear, thou yeoman staunch and true;
I have noted thy great wisdom, of thy counsel I have need;
In my kingdom there is much for us to do."

And now the gig rolls upward and Elijah's large, broad hand
Waves adieu to friendly mortals in the glade;
And we see it is a part of our much loved Dala-land,
Still and dreamy in the fir-clad mountain's shade.

See the shore-line of the lake there, how its reds and yellows blend
With bright patches, where the housewife's herb plot thrives,
And small boys are pointing upward as the flying wheels ascend,
"See our old neighbor, how recklessly he drives."

There is Leksand's church spire slender, and the belfry's iron tongue
Rings the sabbath dirge to speed the honored guest,
And he travels from its echo to the surging of a psalm
From the organ lofts and choirs of the blest.

When thou'rt sitting, oh Elijah, at the Master's laden board,
Look with pity on our wants before too late,
Intercede for our transgressions, we're but men and hungry, Lord,
Pray for Dala-land whose need for bread is great.

Now the sun sets back of Sollerön, but safely through the night
Drives the prophet, by the small and friendly star
That the kindly Father placed there, to mark the path with light
To his hospitable Heavenly home afar.

High in distant barren deserts crawls the evil Scorpion,
And the Dog star bays with mournful voice 'ul hoarse;
There's the great Bear, the Serpent, and the ever roaring Lion,
But for none of them God's steed will change his course.

Rimmed with flame his flaring nostrils, showers of sparks his swift
hoofs spray,
Through the hurtling Heavenly spaces, as they rise
To the spreading arch of golden trees that line the Milky Way,
That leads upward to the gates of Paradise;

And the Master comes out on the wide, front stoop,
"Come thou in, holy prophet, welcome guest!"
And he beckons to an angel lad who leaves a nearby group
And to pasture leads the sweating horse to rest.

Norwegian peasant painting exhibited the same fundamental characteristics as the Swedish, with this important difference, that economic and social determinants narrowed the gap between the art of the countryside and that of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy. Consequently the painting of these upper classes partook of some of the qualities of rural painting and *vice versa*. This probably explains why in the Norwegian countryside there were few, if any, attempts to imitate gobelins and therefore practically none of the very naive textual paintings so common in Sweden. By contrast, Norwegian peasant painting was much more sophisticated, showing better mastery of such forms as baroque and rococco floral ornamentation, landscapes and portraiture. It was a time of prosperity and happiness for the Norwegian yeoman; he felt a keen desire to

surround himself with the beauty that he saw in the towns and on the estates. He imitated the basic styles of urban painting, but in the fullness of his strength, in the security of a social order of which he was the confident master, he let his own fancy play upon them in a manner which frequently emancipated him from the bonds of imitation and launched him upon the way of creation. He built his own church and decorated it richly, as his instinct told him it should be, for the Norwegian peasant of the eighteenth century still had in him a goodly measure of colorful Catholicism. In his own home he was a free man who made his own judgments and lived his own life; this sense of independence he expressed in the strong colors and the bold stylistic adaptations which he spread upon his furniture. Under his hand even a cheese box assumed dignity. His fondness for portraiture was partly an expression of his self assurance and partly the product of his allodial family pride. He left his religion in the church more than did the Swedish peasant, and very rarely did he allow religious motifs to be painted in his own home, though he was often pious enough to put a line of prayer on his cupboard or his chest, provided it could be fitted into the ornamental pattern. Whereas the European upper classes produced a rococco marked by fragility and femininity, by delicate intermediate coloring, the Norwegian yeomanry enthusiastically accepted its joy of life but endowed it with strength. Halvdan Koht declares with justification, that "when we get into the second half of the eighteenth century, we are confronted with a Norwegian decorative art so brightly fresh, so European in motif, and yet so completely national in spirit and tone, that a finer art has not been developed in Norway since the viking age."¹⁹

The careers of two Scandinavian peasant painters in the second half of the century illustrate well the circumstances under which this art was produced. Per Hörberg (1746-1816), and Peder Aadness (1739-?) were the best in Sweden and Norway respectively. Hörberg was born in a dreadfully poor soldier's croft in the province of Kronoberg; as a child he frequently had to beg for the family's food. A precociously artistic child, he busied himself constantly with wood carving and painting on birch bark and lichens. In 1762 he was apprenticed to a master painter in Växiö; by 1769 he was considered fully trained and

then he married. He was still very poor, but since he was skillful with his hands he made wooden shoes and other things for a living. Little by little he earned enough money by painting to rent one-fourth of a farm and became a peasant, a considerable rise in the social scale from the little croft where he was born. Thus far his painting, though decorative, had been altogether that of an amateur; but between 1783 and 1787 he made three extended visits to Stockholm, where he studied at the Royal Academy of Draughtsmanship, met Gustav III, and was permitted by His Majesty to view the art collections at Drottningholm Palace. Well launched now on his artistic career, he bought a farm in Risinge parish in the province of Finspång (1788). Thereafter he received as many orders for paintings in churches and in the homes of the peasantry as he could fill in his spare time and acquired a neat competency. For two years before his death he enjoyed a public pension of 100 *riksdaler banco* per year. The ultra-romantic poet Atterbom edited and published his autobiography.²⁰

Peder Aadness grew up in more fortunate circumstances than his contemporary, Hörberg, and in due course inherited his father's farm (in the 1770's). He, too, showed artistic capacity at an early age, and finally got a few months of instruction from Nils Thaaning at the War College in Oslo. As early as the 1760's, Aadness began to go about and paint at the homes of the rich peasants in the provinces of Land, Hadeland, and Valdres in eastern Norway. It was probably from Eggert Munch that he got his style in portraiture, but his sketchbook from the War College is filled with motifs from high-noon rococco,—urns, garlands, animals, children, and commoners. From such sources the motifs of the towns were brought out into the country districts through the agency of decorative painting. Aadness gained such a reputation that he was regarded long after his death as a kind of magician and as a peasant who could put even the bureaucracy to shame, the latter probably because he was employed to decorate even their homes with landscapes and portraits. No one has done better "*rosemaling*" (literally, "rose painting," a term which covers all Norwegian peasant painting in the rococco floral motif).²¹

Peasant music, or folk music, developed unusual variety and richness in the eighteenth century. To no small degree this was

due to the adoption of the violin in its various forms; here was an instrument which was sufficiently versatile in its qualities to give adequate expression to the multitude of varying moods now breaking in upon a still communal rural society. Games, dances, and festivities remained basically the same, the same music was necessary now as before, but in addition a great deal that was new served to enrich the musical art. Here again Norway and Sweden were far in the van. Every community in Scandinavia, however, had its *spillemand*, usually a tailor or a shoemaker, who enlivened the party when he appeared with his fiddle tucked under his arm. He knew everyone, was often a good story teller and a great joker, and enjoyed the triumph of his life when he could teach the crowd a new dance or play a new tune. These stories, jokes, and melodies he probably picked up from some wandering gypsy, or on his own travels to participate in fiddlers' bouts. Not infrequently he composed something new himself, and then his fame spread far and wide. Because he was about so much, the fiddler was likely to develop a taste for liquor. By the "holy" ones in the community he was usually regarded as a limb of Satan. If he was sober and thrifty, however, he could normally lay aside a good deal of money, for the "fiddler's" plate was likely to contain as much as the collection plate on Sundays. It is safe to say that but for the richer life of the eighteenth century, Scandinavian folk-music would have been much less developed than it appears in the nineteenth century collections.²²

At the close of the eighteenth century, Scandinavian peasant art was at its climax. As yet the old rural society which had produced it was comparatively intact, and had anyone then given thought to the problem, he would probably have concluded that a brilliant future was in store for the plain man's art. And certain phases of it did continue far into the next century. Nevertheless, with the possible exception of Sweden, it had little ahead of it after 1800. The bitter years after 1807 produced stagnation, and then followed the reconstruction of Scandinavian agriculture, which left the art of the peasantry

very little on which to build. Most tragic was the fact that in the process of its own development the artistic philosophy of the upper classes disdained unprofessional rural art. Instead of building farther upon its own solid heritage, therefore, the rural population was taught to depreciate its artistic achievements and to put away such childish things. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie had advanced in all three countries to the point where they not only mastered the professional art of the courts, but had very largely annexed it and stamped it with their own trademarks. To professional art this was clear again, auguring well for its development in a sound, democratic direction. Technically and ideologically this upper-class art was headed toward better things. Professional Scandinavian artists had already made a place for themselves in the international artistic community, with which they were in close functional contact.

CHAPTER VI

•

THE SOCIAL STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL POWER: THE OLD REGIME, 1720-1814

Others may sing of the wine and the wealth and the mirth,
The portly presence of potentates goodly in girth;—
Mine be the dirt and the dross, the dust and the scum of the earth!

Theirs be the music, the colour, the glory, the gold;
Mine be a handful of ashes, a mouthful of mould.
Of the maimed, of the halt and the blind in the rain and the cold—
Of these shall my songs be fashioned, my tales be told.¹

The political institutions of the Scandinavian countries reflected the improving conditions of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry more slowly than literature and art. But as the eighteenth century wore on it became increasingly apparent that these lower classes were the heirs of the political future. It is not, therefore, in constitutional reforms, but in the social consciousness and activity of the various interest groups, that the key to the political history of the eighteenth century must be sought.

The nobility was still, in 1720, the foremost social group in Sweden and Denmark; in Norway, however, it played but a small role compared to the bureaucracy, and even in Sweden and Denmark it functioned largely as a bureaucracy. Noblemen everywhere enjoyed special privileges, like exemption from certain taxes and the right to exact dues and services from their peasants, but in the seventeenth century the rise of absolute monarchy had considerably reduced their extensive political powers. The native Danish nobility passed into a period of decline after 1660 when Frederick III, assisted by the bourgeoisie, promulgated the Monarchical Ordinance (*Kongeloven*) which made the monarchy hereditary and absolute, for Danish kings preferred thereafter not to depend entirely upon the native nobility to supply the officeholders, but appointed quali-

fied non-nobles and foreign, especially German, nobles, who would be more dependent upon, and therefore more obedient to, the royal authority. The Swedish nobility, under Christina and Charles X, had enriched themselves by encroachments upon crown lands, and had become so officious that Charles XI found it necessary, here too with the help of the commoners, to clip their wings in the so-called "reduction." Both the Swedish and the Dano-Norwegian governments were still, in 1720 and for many years after, compelled to look to the nobility for many of their public servants, for this class was best able to educate its sons. On the other hand, the curbs upon the political influence of the nobility caused the right to hold office to be viewed by this class as an especially important prerogative; this was particularly true in Sweden where the "reduction" had plunged many nobles into such poverty that some extra income became necessary to maintain social status.

The clergy, throughout the eighteenth century, occupied only a quasi-political status in Denmark-Norway, while in Sweden they constituted a separate chamber in the *riksdag*. Since the clergy served the established churches, they were office holders; but they performed many civil, as well as religious, functions. Naturally, therefore, their reports were read not only for information on ecclesiastical affairs, but for material that might help to shape secular policies. In their own chamber in the Swedish *riksdag* the clergy of that country possessed an organ of political action, which was second in importance only to the chamber of the nobility, and in Denmark-Norway they were always close to the government. With the nobles and civil officials the clergy had many cultural and class affinities. They were as well educated, they had sometimes occupied minor civil offices while waiting for a church appointment, they associated socially with the upper classes rather than with the lower, and they often exhibited in their dealings with the common people the same cupidity and mastership that characterized other officials.

This kinship with the upper classes was also shared at least by the upper bourgeoisie, and owing to the steady growth of mercantile capitalism in the eighteenth century their political importance increased. The bourgeoisie, too, were able to educate their sons, some of whom went into the church and

others into the public services. Owing to the emphasis which the governments in the eighteenth century placed upon industry and commerce, the business men gained much social approbation, and those who were most successful were normally rewarded with titles and medals, sometimes even with peerage. Business men and bureaucrats of middle class origin passed up, now and then, into the ranks of the nobility; and noblemen did not deign to make money in business. Oscar Levertin relates about the father of Madam Nordenflycht, that he was first called Anders Anderson, but later took the name of Nordbohm, and "was ennobled Nordenflycht after he had sat for thirty years writing figures in the Treasury."² His was no isolated instance. Thus, by their accessions from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, by the exercise of their duties in the interest of the national economy, and by their private business connections, the bureaucracy and the nobility were progressively imbued with the spirit of the middle class. In Denmark-Norway, where the monarchy was absolute and the various social classes enjoyed no special representation in a legislature, this social assimilation encountered almost no obstacles; but in Sweden the nobility had a hereditary right to separate representation in its own *riksdag* chamber, possessing thus both the means and a motive for maintaining its class character. It is against the background of these different conditions that the middle-class struggle for political power must be seen.

While the nobility, the clergy, and the bourgeoisie were gradually being fused into virtually a single upper class, the peasantry remained a separate lower class. Accustomed for hundreds of years to the domination of noble proprietors, to the condescending superiority of the clergy, and to the exploitation of the merchants, they felt themselves to be always in a state of social warfare with them. The upper classes always spoke of the peasantry as *almuen*, in Swedish *allmogen* (the common people), a term tinged with contempt, and the peasants referred to the others as *herremænd* and *byfolk* (lords and townspeople). The antipathy between the peasants and the upper classes expressed itself in many ways. It crops out frequently in Scandinavian folk literature. A Danish ballad complains bitterly of the manner in which the gentlemen rob the peasants; folk-tales from all three countries relate how the

honest peasant wife and her husband manage to tar and feather the pastor who has tried to seduce her; a Danish ballad gleefully relates the seduction of a noble maid by a "nasty" peasant lad; and the irritation of the peasantry against the merchants is reflected in tales of how the peasant is cheated at horse trading. Usually there was outward calm, but there was always grumbling underneath. Occasionally sporadic riots occurred. The Norwegian peasants, who were better able than the Danish and Swedish to preserve their economic and personal independence, were particularly prone to violence; it frequently happened that if a sermon lasted longer than the legal limit of one hour some peasant would rise ponderously and inform the preacher that the congregation had had enough. Ordinarily, however, it was not the peasantry that won these tilts with the authorities, for it was easier to be wordy than brave.

One right the Scandinavian peasantry always enjoyed, namely, to "go to the king" with their troubles. The rulers knew the value of keeping the loyalty of the masses, and usually listened kindly to the homely, direct speech of their representatives. The peasants, therefore, looked to the king for protection against the tyrannies of petty officials, like the good royalists that they were; and the monarch valued their loyalty as a check upon the independence of the nobles. It must not be supposed, either, that the peasants were entirely without political experience, even under such an absolute monarchy as Denmark-Norway in the eighteenth century, for in their villages they practiced no little selfgovernment; in Norway and Sweden they were convened from time to time in local assemblies, or *tings*, where larger affairs were considered; and in Sweden the peasants elected their own chamber in the *riksdag*. Nevertheless, they had many strides to make in economic improvement and culture before they could contend equally with the upper classes on the political field.

I. POLITICAL STRUGGLES IN SWEDEN UNTIL 1789

The Norwegian bullet which killed Charles XII in 1718 also ended the virtual absolutism of the Swedish monarchy. The "Madman of the North" had thoroughly discredited the system, so hopefully agreed to by the commoners when Charles XI had humbled their enemies, the great nobles, by the "reduc-

tion." At the conclusion of the Great Northern War, Sweden was exhausted and grimly determined that kings should be powerless to ruin her again. The moment was opportune for the Estates to reassert their old authority, for Charles XII had never married and his sister Ulrika Eleonora had no legal claim to the throne. Therefore the *riksdag* of 1719, for which she issued the call and into whose hands she placed her fortune, was able to rewrite the Swedish constitution and assign to the Crown such powers as they would.

There was general agreement that the monarchy must be strictly limited to the will of the people as expressed by the Estates, and there was no disposition to depart from the traditional *riksdag* of four chambers, or Estates,—nobility, clergy, bourgeoisie, and peasantry. But the three lower orders, remembering that the nobility had formerly so abused their extensive powers that even an uncurbed monarchy had been a relief, were eager to forestall a recurrence. And here the problem was to prevent the nobility from achieving a monopoly on the administrative offices. To this class, however, office was since the "reduction" more than ever important. The contest was long and bitter, continuing through three *riksdags*, but in the end a compromise was effected, which stipulated that in all appointments experience and fitness should be the prime requisites, and that no candidate should be rejected on the ground of inferior origin or social position.³ This left the recommending and appointing authorities free to select a noble in preference to a non-noble of equal ability and experience. As a protection against possible political reprisals and royal arbitrariness it was further provided that no official might be dismissed without trial and judgment.

The new constitution deprived the Crown of all real power by investing the Council of the Realm (*riksrådet*), reduced for effectiveness from twenty-four to sixteen members, with final jurisdiction in all important matters. It was expected that the Crown would sign all its major decisions. The Council, elected by the Estates, thus became virtually a parliamentary cabinet. A large group of minor matters did not require the assent of the Council, but here too the king's administrative authority was practically nullified by the requirement that his decisions be made in the presence of two members of the Council and

that a full record of the proceedings be kept. Even the king's appointing power was drastically cut, and he was forbidden to create new offices and noble titles. Should the Crown violate these provisions, the Estates were released from their oath of allegiance.⁴

Legislation and ultimate administrative control were henceforth to rest with the four chambers in the *riksdag*. The concurring vote of three Estates effected a decision, and a vote of two against two constituted a negative. For the purpose of considering questions of war and peace, diplomacy, finance, and—significantly—all matters requiring secrecy, a Committee on Secret Matters (*sekreta utskottet*) was established, consisting of fifty delegates from the nobility, and twenty-five each from the clergy and the bourgeoisie. The peasants were excluded as incapable of understanding such affairs. The recommendations of this committee were almost always accepted by the three upper Estates and thus assured the nobility of a preponderant influence upon national policy.

The misgivings with which many commoners observed the success of the nobles in these important deliberations are understandable, although in retrospect they seem comparatively groundless. It was widely feared that the nobility would attempt to recover what had been lost by the "reduction." But this fear failed to consider that the Swedish nobility of 1720 differed greatly from that of 1670,—that in reality it was far more homogeneous with the clergy and the bourgeoisie. In 1626 the chamber of the nobility had been divided into three classes, of which the first and second contained the greater nobles and the third the far more numerous lesser ones. Since each class had one vote, the two higher classes could control the nobility in the *riksdag*. But so effectively had Charles XI "reduced" the magnates that it proved impossible, when the Estates were now reorganized, to maintain the three-class system in the highest chamber; the numerous, often penurious, lesser nobles, whose chief function was civil service, now successfully transformed it into a nobiliary democracy where every family had one vote.⁵ The lesser nobility was also closely allied in viewpoint and interest with the bourgeoisie. Engaged so largely in administration, the nobility dealt constantly with economic problems; furthermore, in the decade 1720-1730 they

owned probably one-third of the Swedish iron industry, and their capital was heavily involved in other non-agricultural enterprises.⁶ The ideological contact between the nobility and the bourgeoisie was further promoted by the frequent elevation of non-noble public servants to the *noblesse de la robe* and by the frequent choice of noble officials and magistrates to represent the burghers of the smaller towns in the *riksdag*. With the bourgeoisie and the lesser nobility the chamber of the clergy were usually in close accord, for, though recruited from all social classes, the clergy enjoyed the same education and social rank as the townsmen and the nobles, were themselves servants of the state, and aspired to send their sons into the church or the public service.

The chamber of the peasantry, however, occupied a position of inferiority far into the nineteenth century, even though its membership was gradually becoming politically conscious. Evidence of this growing consciousness is the decision, in 1720, that only bona fide owners of their own land might sit in this chamber.⁷ Nevertheless, the peasants were badly educated and poorly led, capable of practically no political initiative, in consequence of which their representatives too often became mere pawns for clever manipulators in the other chambers. But it followed from the logic of the socio-political situation, that the peasantry and the king should from time to time make common cause, particularly against the nobility who oppressed the former and kept the latter impotent. When, therefore, in 1719 and 1720, the chamber of the peasantry, scrupulously ignored by the other three, was entirely excluded from representation on the Committee on Secret Matters, its angry members began openly to recommend the restoration of a strong monarchy. Since the clergy and the bourgeoisie were both at loggerheads with the nobility over the patent of privileges, which the latter in 1719 had persuaded the queen to grant them, the chief minister, Count Arvid Horn, found it advisable to adjourn the *riksdag* of 1720 as soon as the queen's husband, Frederick I, had agreed to the further curtailment of the royal powers, the only condition on which the three upper estates would permit him to supersede her on the throne. The peasants, however, hoping to take advantage of the isolation of the nobility, voted against adjournment.⁸

Upon this ominous note of social conflict Sweden began the period known in her history as the Age of Freedom (*Frihetstiden*), which endured until the *coup d'état* of Gustav III (1772). The adjournment in 1720 by no means ended the peasant movement for a monarchy strong enough to check the nobility. The new king, Frederick I, had hardly subscribed to the limitations upon his powers when he began his efforts to have them removed. During the customary journey made by every new Swedish monarch (*Eriksgratun*), he visited and flattered the peasants, skilfully intimating that there was much he wished to do for them if he only had the power. The results were apparent in a vigorously royalist chamber of peasants when the *riksdag* met again in 1723. But Arvid Horn and the three dominant classes drove a wedge between the king and his supporters by skilfully using the claims of the pretender, the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, a nephew of Charles XII. Thereupon they sharply reproved the peasantry and summarily punished the royal agents who had advised them, but Arvid Horn satisfied the more moderate elements by consulting the fourth Estate on several important matters, though membership in the Committee on Secret Matters was still denied the peasantry. The king was forced to surrender abjectly, and thereafter devoted himself to hunting and love affairs.⁹ Though defeated in their efforts to strengthen the monarchy, the peasants found good cause in 1725, when a new northern war threatened, to join the bourgeoisie in support of Arvid Horn's pacific policy.

For several years after 1723 the constitutional question was dormant, owing to the sensibly moderate policy pursued by Count Arvid Horn. More than anyone else he was responsible for the new constitution, and as long as he remained in office Sweden enjoyed peace and prosperity.¹⁰ He refused to go the full length of the extreme mercantilism enthusiastically supported by the intelligentsia. His strong hand preserved internal order and effectively restrained the reckless elements which would have thrown Sweden into foreign adventures. It was such a policy of restraint and caution as the rural classes could appreciate, both because it did not completely deliver them into the hands of the lords and the merchants, and because it fitted the temperament developed by their work and social

environment. But to the younger, unchastened bureaucratic nobility, confident of their places and zealous for achievement, Arvid Horn's caution seemed cowardice, worthy only of old women in night-caps. Thus arose, in the 1730's, an opposition, the more dangerous since the peasants were excluded from the Committee on Secret Matters. The members of the opposition proclaimed themselves *Hats* in contradistinction to the *Caps*. Because the *Hats* embraced a bold, urban, ultra-mercantilistic economic program they had powerful support in the chamber of the bourgeoisie; and they secured complete control of the nobility in the *riksdag* of 1738-1739.¹¹ Although a majority of the clergy were *Caps*, the *Hats* manned the Committee on Secret Matters, and compelled Arvid Horn's resignation in December, 1738. With him went most of those members of the Council who like himself belonged to the upper nobility; their places were filled by lesser nobles and the government was thus "democratized."¹² More than ever, therefore, it became a government by the business bureaucracy.

The period from 1739 to 1772 was one of incessant conflict between the *Hats* and the *Caps*, with the former continuously in possession of the offices until 1765, the latter constantly plotting to seize them, foreign powers subsidizing both parties according to their own interest, and the Crown hopefully trying to use now the one, now the other party to regain some authority. The normal stronghold of the *Hats* was the chamber of the nobility, but the *Caps* were always represented there. The bourgeoisie consistently supported the *Hats*, because they valued that party's subsidies to industry and trade, until the mounting expenses of government resulted in a grave depreciation of the currency.¹³ Thereafter, about 1760, the townsmen inclined more and more to the *Caps*. Generally speaking, the interests of the bourgeoisie were well served, whether the *Hats* or the *Caps* were in office. Both parties adhered to the prevailing economic doctrine of mercantilism, and although the *Caps* earlier than the *Hats* retreated from its extreme forms, the latter also realized the dangers of extreme mercantilism before they had to give way to their rivals (1765).¹⁴ The clergy meanwhile wavered from one party to the other, less from conviction than from a desire to be with prevailing public opinion. After 1762, however, they tended more and more to

the *Caps*, with whom they had come to feel a common cause in the effort to break the virtual monopoly of the nobility on the public offices.

Although the peasants were almost always in opposition to the *Hats*, they were not thereby consistent supporters of the *Caps*, for they were more royalist than anything else, and when the *Caps* championed the existing constitution, the peasants were usually on the side of the king and the court party. The Swedish peasants were aggrieved at the preference that the government showed for urban occupations, but most particularly by the fact that there was no power in the state strong enough to keep petty officials from exploiting and bullying them, nor the higher ones from plunging the country into reckless wars which were costly to the common people in both men and money. The peasants showed their hatred of the ruling classes on more than one occasion, and demonstrated sound if somewhat primitive political sense.

At the conclusion of the disastrous war with Russia (1741-1743), the peasants of Dalarne marched on Stockholm. The adventurous, overconfident *Hats*, after their victory over Arvid Horn, plunged the country into this war of "honor," in which Finland was overrun by the enemy and Sweden herself threatened with invasion. In consequence, the full force of Swedish patriotism was directed against the *Hats* and their ridiculous claim to heroism; Olof Dalin wrote a sarcastic poem describing the tragic misfortunes of the war, and closed every verse with the withering refrain, "But the *Hat* is crowned with laurel, achievement, and honor." Since it was necessary to choose a crown prince to succeed Frederick I, the three upper Estates in the *riksdag* agreed to elect Adolf Frederick of the Holstein-Gottorp family, a protégé of the Tsarina Elizabeth, if she would agree to restore Finland. But the peasants' chamber gave their vote to the Danish crown prince, Frederick, partly on the ground that a unified Scandinavia would be able to recover Finland, but hardly less in the hope that their candidate would curb the Swedish nobility as that of Denmark had been curbed. So strong was the demand among the peasants for the Danish crown prince, that even the upper estates were preparing to turn to him in June, 1743, if Russia did not quickly grant good terms. Civil war was imminent.

In April, when the Dalecarlian regiment was ordered to the front, the carved board (*budkaveln*), with which the peasantry was called to assemble, was sent out for a meeting at Falun, June 8. There it was decided to march on Stockholm in a body and force the election of the Danish crown prince. They wanted "one king and not so many," and they wanted no Russian puppet. In Stockholm there was panic, and only the arrival of a courier from Finland with the news that peace had been concluded gave the government courage to deal decisively with the motley horde of peasants which had entered the city. In spite of the mutiny of some soldiers, enough remained loyal to cow the mob quickly and thoroughly. The leaders were punished and the use of the *budkaveln* was henceforth forbidden, but not for months did the government feel sure that the peasantry would not rally to a possible Danish army supporting Crown Prince Frederick. The government therefore endured the humiliation of a Russian army on Swedish soil during the following winter to protect the position of Adolf Frederick.¹⁵

So serious was the situation of Sweden in 1743-1744 that the *Hats* developed into a sober, responsible, national party; even the *Caps* were forced to help them in the emergency. The new crown prince, Adolf Frederick, assisted by his dominant and far more capable wife, Louisa Ulrika, sister of Frederick the Great, supported the *Hats* at first, but soon began intriguing to increase the royal power, and hence naturally turned to the peasants for support of their court party. The movement came to a head in the *riksdag* of 1755-56, when King Adolf Frederick, instigated by the queen and depending largely on the known royalism of the peasants, especially those of Dalecarlia, attempted a *coup d'état*. Its failure was complete humiliation for the royal family. Frederick the Great wrote to d'Alembert: "It must be something terrible to be king in Sweden."¹⁶

In the years that followed, the bureaucratic nobility showed more and more clearly that it was running amuck. It plunged Sweden into the costly and futile war against Prussia (1757-1762). By insisting upon observance of the principle of seniority in appointments, both civil and military, it demonstrated its devotion to class interest rather than to the national interest.

Offices were regarded as saleable property. In 1762 commoners were excluded from the possibility of enjoying the higher offices by the resolution of the chamber of the nobility that no new noble families should be admitted there.¹⁷ Firmly seated in the saddle, the officials, great and small, committed many arbitrary and oppressive acts. In the 1760's the *Hats* became increasingly a party of the nobility, the *Caps* a party of commoners; thus party strife developed into class conflict. In 1765, when the victorious *Caps* established freedom of the press, a flood of literature hostile to the nobility was released, and the chamber of the clergy resolved in the *riksdag* of 1765-66 to exclude every clergyman who had himself been ennobled, or whose children had been ennobled.¹⁸ Meanwhile the royal family, where the young Crown Prince Gustav was rapidly assuming leadership, was able to build up a new court party, which as usual could count on aid from the peasantry.

This socio-political struggle culminated during a period of economic disintegration which increased class bitterness. Currency inflation had resulted from the *Hats'* lavish subsidies to industry and trade as well as from the deficits incurred during the recent war. With the post-war deflation, a tidal wave of bankruptcies overwhelmed the urban centers. Economy, administrative responsibility, and currency reform became slogans of the hour. The *Hats* saved themselves in 1761 by buying off a number of *Caps* with funds supplied by the French minister; but in 1765 the economic situation was dangerous, and the *Hats* were deprived of the higher offices.¹⁹

Thereafter the *Hats* began to profess an interest in strengthening the hands of the king, with the result that they and the court party made plans to revise the constitution. They were aided in their opposition to the *Caps* by several circumstances. The sudden appreciation of the currency which the latter effected worked hardships upon business as acute as the former depreciation. The economic situation was still grave. Although the *Caps* were recruited mainly from the clergy and the bourgeoisie, numerically the least powerful social groups in the realm, they pursued a narrow partisan policy, which caused many citizens to support the *Hats* and the peasants to revive their royalism. Finally, since the great mass of the subordinate bureaucracy was *Hat* in its political affiliation, the *Cap* Council

had difficulty in enforcing its decrees. On December 12, 1768, more than a year before the time scheduled for the next *riksdag*, the king and the crown prince, according to plan, appeared before the Council and virtually went on a strike by declaring that until a *riksdag* should be called, the Crown would refuse all responsibility for the government. The *Cap* Council, who wanted no *riksdag* at this time, when the temper of the country was hostile, attempted to govern, as the *Hats* had on occasion done before them, by means of a facsimile of the king's signature. But the subordinate bureaucracy refused to obey, and the *Caps* were forced to call a special *riksdag* to meet in April, 1769.²⁰

After an electoral campaign of unprecedented intensity, the *Hats* won a too complete victory, so complete that they could dispense with the court party, and so complete as to encourage dissension within their own ranks. After evicting the *Caps* from the leading offices, they forgot their pledges to the Court to revise the constitution and resumed their orgy of expenditure. The result could only be a violent reaction against them in the *riksdag* of 1771-72, necessitated by the accession of Gustav III. After this election the *Caps* controlled the three non-noble chambers, and the *Hats* the nobility. The contest was now one of the "free-born" (non-noble) estates against the "well-born" (noble) estate, the prize being the right to public office. As usual, the struggle was closely observed by the foreign powers, Russia, Prussia, Denmark, France, and England. Russia and Denmark-Norway, who desired to maintain the paralyzing Swedish constitution, supported the *Caps* and opposed every increase of royal power; France, supporting the *Hats* to ensure Swedish aid in European affairs, was nevertheless prepared to see the monarchy strengthened, provided it would remain independent of Russia. Unable to persuade the two parties to compose their differences and unite in a positive national policy, the young king, with the spectacle of the first partition of Poland before him and before the Swedish people, took matters into his own hands and accomplished the bloodless *coup d'état* of August 19, 1772. The stroke was comparatively easy, because the *Caps*, who took over the government in 1771, so neglected relief measures for the disastrous famine of

1771-1773, that the peasantry were more ready than ever to welcome a strong monarchy.²¹

Undoubtedly Gustav III acted wisely when he terminated the Age of Freedom; for that very reason, perhaps, it has too often been undervalued. It is a widely credited legend, that this was a period of mere anarchy, comparable to that in Poland before the first partition. But closely examined the Age of Freedom is a fundamentally important stage in Swedish constitutional development. It was marred by corruption, but nowhere in the eighteenth century were politics noted for their purity. The party fanaticism of *Hats* and *Caps* threatened several times to ruin the country; parties were, however, in their infancy in the eighteenth century, and not only in Sweden; they had not yet developed in the school of experience those formulae of behavior known as ethics. The parliamentary representation, based, as we have seen, upon well defined social classes, gave class interests free play—probably an essentially wholesome circumstance, but one which endowed Swedish politics with a bitterness that seemed absent in other countries where government was the prerogative of only one or two social classes. This bitterness was aggravated by the impossibility of removing officials except by court processes, for under a system of parliamentary administrative control this necessitated trials for treason and malfeasance whenever a change of party occurred.

The Age of Freedom was thus an experiment in parliamentary government, during which Sweden, with no precedents to follow, was groping her way forward, like England. It was also a period when Sweden was reluctantly and with difficulty putting away the mentality of a world power for that of a small, democratic, national state.²² The *Hats* represented in their foreign policy the continued strength of the imperial idea, whereas the cautious *Caps* embodied the sober realization that Sweden was through with conquest. The Age of Freedom witnessed the clear formulation of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and fixed it firmly in the political dogma of the Swedish people. A memorial of 1752 stated, in almost the same words as the French constitution of 1791, that the king "has received his prerogatives, not from himself, but from God through the free choice of the Estates and the authority of the

law."²³ Far from being merely a period of relative anarchy, the Age of Freedom was rich in political experiment. That, in 1772, the experiment with parliamentary government was recognized as a failure in its outward form did not invalidate the constitutional theory it had developed, nor render futile the experience it had provided the Swedish people.

The country hailed Gustav III as a deliverer. His moderate use of the power he had seized served to increase his popularity, both at home and abroad.²⁴ He established a regime similar to that of Gustavus Adolphus with such changes as subsequent political experience had proved to be necessary. That its provisions could be justified by the political theory then in vogue, especially that of Montesquieu, lent it more authority. A share in the power of legislation and complete control over the administration were henceforth to be vested in the Crown. Since the Estates, however, retained the right to share the legislative function and reserved the right of taxation, the monarchy was limited. The nobiliary bureaucracy had welcomed the *coup d'état* because it relieved them, as they thought, from the threat of the lower classes, but they had been unchecked too long to become quickly the pliant tools of a strong monarchy.²⁵ To the delight of the peasantry, in particular, the king at once proceeded to call administrative officers all over Sweden to account for their abuses. In Finland, Halland, and Scania the peasants rose up against officialdom under the erroneous impression that the day of these tormentors was quite done, and bitter was their disappointment when the king's troops appeared against them. Not for several years after the famine and the social revolts of 1771-1773 did the ferment among the Swedish peasantry subside. During the Age of Freedom they had become increasingly conscious of their political power; and now, as always, they pursued a realistic policy of class interest. Their royalism was not doctrinaire, therefore when the king adopted measures that were contrary to that interest they made their opposition very plain.

The most important of such measures was the establishment of the royal brandy monopoly in 1776. Aggravated, like the other non-noble estates, at the obvious preference shown by Gustav III for the higher nobility, the peasants now acquired a definite class grievance. The right to distill his own brandy

from his own grain was to the Swedish peasant immemorial, and no economist's proof of the adverse effect upon the balance of trade,²⁶ nor any argument for the righteousness of a tax upon brandy, would he recognize. He showed his opposition in no uncertain manner: in the *riksdag* he spoke of little else; at home he violated the law and conducted a perpetual warfare with enforcement officials. Meanwhile the king aroused opposition also in other quarters. The lower nobility was incensed at his partiality to the higher and alarmed at his apparent intention to make the nobility merely ornamental, as in France. The bureaucracy refused to become mere executors of the royal will; the clergy resisted the king's commercial traffic in pastorates and warned against the immorality consequent upon the royal system of distilleries. The bourgeoisie began to inveigh against needless expenditures and costly corruption. The crop failures between 1780 and 1786, with their attendant starvation, disease and death, disposed the peasantry to violence, and added much to the severity of the economic depression that overtook the bourgeoisie after the War of the American Revolution. At the *riksdag* of 1786 the opposition had clear majorities in the nobility and peasantry, with large minorities in the clergy and the bourgeoisie. At every point the king found himself checkmated; the *riksdag* curtly rejected his program.

It was plain to him thereafter that he must break the nobles, who led the opposition. Therefore they must be isolated by conciliating the three non-noble Estates. The clergy he promptly satisfied by certain reforms in the manner of their appointment and promotion. The peasants he won by an important concession in the brandy question. At the *riksdag* of 1786, Gustav III had offered to exchange the monopoly for a permanent tax, but, led by the nobility, the peasantry had at this time agreed only to a temporary tax. When the king refused, the peasant representatives, afraid to return home emptyhanded, threw the blame upon the nobility. In 1787, Gustav III traded for the royal brandy monopoly a system of distillery concessions (*arrendebränning*), under which most of the peasants became concessionaires obligated to pay a tax upon their production. This was done parish by parish, and against the opposition of the anti-royalist elements in the nobility.²⁷

Thus the peasants gained two important objectives, the right to distill brandy at home and the aid of the Crown in their never-ending conflict against the nobles and officials. A large delegation of grateful peasants came to wait upon the king. And Gustav III now had three Estates against the nobility.

Such was the situation upon the commencement of Gustav III's unfortunate war with Russia and Denmark-Norway, 1787-1790. When, in 1788, the noble army officers at Anjala, in Finland, traitorously opened negotiations with Catherine the Great, and Denmark simultaneously prepared to invade Sweden from Norway, Sweden was placed in grave danger. The threatened Dano-Norwegian invasion was in reality a god-send to the king, for he could now appeal directly to the people to defend its own soil. His appeal was not in vain. From every province hosts of peasant volunteers flocked to the colors, furious at the treason of the noble officers. At the *riksdag* of 1789, therefore, Gustav III not only escaped the charge, which the nobility prepared to bring against him, that he had begun the war in violation of the constitution, but he was able, with the enthusiastic support of the peasantry and the somewhat grudging support of the clergy and the bourgeoisie, to revise the constitution in the direction of absolutism.

Although the Estates still retained the powers of legislation and taxation, the Crown thereafter had so firm a hold on the power of administration that it could control the chambers, especially the nobility, which consisted mainly of officeholders. From 1789 until 1809 the monarchy was almost absolute. Gustav III had been forced, however, to purchase the agreement of the non-noble estates to this change in the constitution by granting them important social reforms. Only the highest offices, for example, were to be reserved for the nobility; the right of non-nobles to purchase lands endowed with special privileges was made almost complete; the cities and towns were accorded special rights; the posting obligation of the peasantry was more equitably distributed; and the whole commonalty was guaranteed the enjoyment of certain personal rights and liberties. 1789 thus marks an important stage in the process of breaking down medieval social distinctions. "It [the *coup d'état*] played the same part in our social development as the French Revolution."²⁸

II. SOCIAL POLITICS UNDER DANO-NORWEGIAN ABSOLUTISM
UNTIL 1789

There was no longer any such institution in Norway, nor in Denmark, as the Swedish *riksdag*. Government there, since 1660, had been absolutistic. The struggle for political power could not, therefore, assume those forms of party struggle and political trading which are conventional and natural in a system of popular representation. It was carried on much more primitively, in the very bowels of the social order, and it manifested itself in actual, often physical, conflict between a flesh-and-blood official and the local peasantry, between the favored merchants of the town and the victims of their exploitation. In its essence it was naked class war; and both sides sought the support of the only existing organized political power, namely the absolute monarch. It was inevitable that the monarchy under these circumstances would first incline to support its own officials and the more dominant urban classes. But the monarchs realized fully how tenuous was their hold upon Norway, where there was no central government, and where popular loyalty alone, a slender bond at best, kept that kingdom united with Denmark. They were conscious, therefore, of the necessity of hearing the grievances of the Norwegian people and of making some concessions to satisfy them.

In the Norwegian struggle for political power it is not in the activities of officials, nor townsmen, that interest chiefly centers, but in those of the peasantry. The two former groups were much nearer the throne than the last. In Norwegian society the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie formed a separate, almost foreign element. Many of the officials were actually Danish, and the townsmen spoke a somewhat Norvagicized Danish. Commercial and economic legislation had long favored urban centers at the expense of rural districts. And socially there was a great gulf between the officials, clergy, and townsmen on the one hand, and the peasantry on the other. At home a Norwegian peasant might be a proud and wealthy chieftain; in town he was but another country lout. Against the exactions and exploitations of officials and clergy, too often underpaid and permitted by law to take fees, usually in kind, the peasants had for centuries waged a sporadic fight. The second half of the eighteenth century witnessed a rapid intensi-

fication of their resistance, which prepared them for the important political role they were destined to play in the nineteenth century.²⁹

Prior to 1765 the contest of the peasantry was waged, sporadically and locally, chiefly against officials and clergy. The tithe due the pastor, his greed for offerings, his seizure of the widow's only cow as burial-fee,—these were frequent causes of complaint or even riot in the church. The ordinance on establishing public schools in the rural districts of Norway, April 5, 1741, by stipulating that the parishioners themselves should decide whether or not the necessary tax should be levied, provided them with a weapon which they assiduously used to assert their independence of clerics and officials³⁰ with whom they were chronically at odds. Oftimes their grievances arose out of actual grafting and abuse, but occasionally the peasants blamed the officials for measures that they were loath to believe the king had sanctioned. For, like the Swedish peasants, they were loyal royalists. Not infrequently they carried their grievances directly to Copenhagen, sending delegates "to talk with the king." His Majesty usually received them kindly, and sometimes gratified them by reproving or removing the official against whom they appeared. But the wheels of justice moved slowly, and in the interest of public discipline the leader of a rising was often punished even though the complaints were recognized as justifiable. The attitude of the worst officials is exemplified by that of Baron Krag, *statholder* in Norway in 1714, who considered him "a traitor to his country, who should recommend to the king anything else than that a provincial governor might freely whip and imprison a peasant when it should please him."³¹

The first mass movement of Norwegian peasants against the officials occurred in 1765. Three years earlier a heavy and unjust poll tax had been levied, alike upon everyone over twelve years of age. The national debt had been much increased during the Seven Years' War by the necessity of keeping a large army in Holstein. The tax was paid the first year, but poor harvests and fishing necessitated easements and concessions in 1764. These were not uniform, however, and peasants concluded that the officials were collecting more than the king required. The collections were furthermore being

made with unprecedented vigor; seizure of property for taxes were regular occurrences, and in many places the military were employed to carry out the seizures. Trouble began first in the coast districts north of Bergen, the so-called *Strile-land*, one of the most poverty-stricken regions in the country. Early in March, 1765, a large delegation appeared in Bergen, demanding to see the king's own order on the special poll tax. The governor of the diocese, U. F. von Cicignon, declined and dispersed them with troops. Six weeks later they returned in much larger numbers, successfully defied the military authorities whose troops this time refused to fire upon their class comrades, man-handled the governor and the bailiff, and compelled them to refund the tax-money they had collected. For two or three days the largest city in Norway was in their hands. Not even the bourgeois city guard could be depended upon, for many townsmen were sympathetic. But the peasants conducted themselves with relative moderation and decorum; and on April 20 a new order arrived from Copenhagen granting relief in the matter of the tax, whereupon they went home. When the movement had collapsed—from sheer success—the government instituted a solemn investigation. The leaders were punished, but the masses were credited with having acted upon misunderstanding, not malice, although the government took the precaution to prohibit the use of the symbol by which the peasants called their meetings (*budstikken*). The example of the *Strile-men* had been contagious, however. In other districts, especially Ryfylke, south of Bergen, the peasants had protested emphatically against the special tax; they made it plain, moreover, that the tax was but the last and least tolerable of many grievous circumstances. At the head of the investigating commission was Christian Magnus Falsen, an ardent physiocrat and therefore well disposed to the rural population. Under his leadership and at the order of the government, the officials of Norway, as well as the peasantry, were subjected to an accounting. After a year or two the restlessness among the populace subsided, and in 1772 the special tax was removed.³²

The phenomenal material progress made by the Norwegian bourgeoisie in the second half of the eighteenth century necessarily affected its relation to the state and to the other social groups. Conscious of their own wealth, brought by their com-

mercial connections into close contact with England, and fully conversant with the advanced political and economic theories of their age, members of the Norwegian bourgeoisie made political demands of far-reaching importance. For one thing, as a class, they were developing a nationalist character based on the gradual assimilation of the foreign merchants who had settled in Norway during the seventeenth century and on the rapidly growing number of successful business men of native peasant origin. Then, too, the differences between Danish and Norwegian industry and trade, both as regards products and markets, greatly strengthened the national viewpoint. The economic legislation of the Copenhagen government was also so unfavorable to Norway that the Norwegian bourgeoisie began fervently to desire at least a degree of autonomy. And they were confident that such autonomy would be essentially one of the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie. Since the doctrines of economic and political liberty now current in Norwegian towns were similar to those professed in the English, French, and American cities, the political ferment was but a phase of the bourgeois ascendancy which produced the era of revolution.

The political demands of the bourgeoisie were no less determined by their class interests than those of the peasantry. First in order of importance was their desire that a separate bank be established for Norway. The government's reasons for declining were clearly political, like their whole economic policy, namely the determination to make of Norway and Denmark one economic unit. A separate bank for Norway would but increase the all too evident chasm between the economic interests of the two countries. Another wish of the Norwegian bourgeoisie, which for the same political reasons the government in Copenhagen refused to satisfy, was the establishment of a separate university for Norway. The earliest protagonists of this idea were Gerhard Schöning and Bishop Johan Ernst Gunnerus, both charter members of the Scientific Society of Trondhjem. In 1771 Gunnerus was called by Struensée to Copenhagen to advise him on the matter of a Norwegian university. Revived agitation for the cause moved the reforming minister to consider both the university and the bank plans. A separate Norwegian Department of Commerce (*Kommersekollegium*) was urged from time to time, and several minor

demands all looking toward greater independence for Norwegian business. But it was precisely this independence which the Copenhagen government feared.

The accumulating evidence of the political nature of the Danish economic policy caused the Norwegian bourgeoisie themselves to think in political terms. Norwegian national feeling had never been quite dead. In the eighteenth century several ideological factors combined with obvious group interest to increase nationalism among the Norwegian bourgeoisie: the writings of Holberg, the interest in the sagas, the cult of simplicity and freedom, the dissemination of liberal economic theories. What was more natural than that the merchants and timber magnates should begin to clothe their own demands in the political dress of national aspirations? In 1771, when Struensee was throwing old institutions out faster than he could set up new ones, the Norwegian bourgeoisie were at first hopeful of achieving their objectives, then bitterly disappointed and resentful. But even the overthrow of the revolutionizing minister and the Danish national reaction under Ove Høeg Guldberg did not advance their cause. At the same time the economic depression, the crop failures of 1771 and 1772, the Danish grain monopoly, and poor fishing brought distress to a climax in late 1772 and 1773. These circumstances favored Gustav III of Sweden, for, fearing a war with Russia and Denmark as a result of his strengthening of the Swedish constitution, he now endeavored to realize the ancient ambition of his country to acquire Norway and at the same time confound his enemy Denmark. Swedish agents travelled extensively in Norway, and found willing ears among the peasants and the bourgeoisie in the regions contiguous to Sweden.³³

Confronted with the danger of losing Norway the new government in Copenhagen sent Prince Carl of Hesse to the country as *statholder*, and drove a wedge between the peasantry and the townsmen by the simple expedient of repealing, so far as Norway was concerned, the special head tax of 1762. This last would have been necessary in any case, if only to save face for the authorities, for collection had practically ceased. Thereafter the demands of the bourgeoisie could with impunity be ignored. But the atmosphere was tense, and in several towns riots occurred. Bergen, in the autumn of 1773, held a veritable

Boston Tea Party, when smuggling citizens seized control of the harbor and unloaded their wares. In a message to the customs collector they quoted Isaiah 33, and despite a handsome reward put up by the governor not a man of the one hundred and fifty was apprehended.³⁴ But the war-scare and the economic troubles subsided somewhat in 1775, and when the American colonies began their revolution and prices rose on the world market, the Norwegian bourgeoisie found things more immediately important to think about than universities, monetary policies, and national independence.

Serious political crises are especially liable to occur in times of market recessions. The political crises of 1764-5, 1772-3, and that of 1786-89 were each preceded by economic depressions. The latest of these, the Lofthuus movement of 1786-87, was the second mass movement of the Norwegian peasantry against the bureaucracy and this time also against the bourgeoisie. Indeed, the bureaucracy now appeared to the peasants more as tools of the bourgeoisie than as an independent class. There had always been complaints and sporadic resistance by the peasantry against the policy of official differentiation between the rural and the urban, or mercantile, occupations, and against the favoritism shown the towns through grants of privileges and monopolies. The archives contain many documentary proofs of this resistance, and folk-literature is full of allusions to the incessant victimization of the weaker class by the stronger. Hedged about by privileges designed to promote an infantile capitalism, the merchants and timber magnates developed in the second half of the eighteenth century into very husky youngsters who used their favored position mercilessly to exploit the defenseless peasants. The latter were forced by circumstances, when not by law, to deal almost entirely with one town, often with but one merchant, and were regularly victimized. They were compelled to exchange their products for diluted brandy and adulterated tobacco; in their turn they attempted to pass off rotten timber and poor fish. The worst aspect was that in the absence of any competitive bidding the peasants, whether buying or selling, had to accept the merchant's prices. In an era of rising standards of living and rising prices, the rural population easily became victims of the predatory credit systems of the bourgeoisie, who were eager to place

their fluid capital profitably. In the process of developing the timber industry, the capitalists acquired large tracts of forest lands, and reduced the resident population to virtual serfdom. Denmark's grain monopoly in southern Norway also became increasingly oppressive, for it gave the Danish exporters and the Norwegian merchants the advantage of the rising prices; and when in the early 1780's crop failures occurred in Norway the peasant users of imported grain were placed in a very dangerous position. Added to these grievances the multiplicity of complicated and though petty, yet constantly growing taxes, together with flagrant corruption in the administration, furnished material enough for a wide-spread revolt.

The conflagration began in southern Norway, owing in large part to the peculiar situation of the peasants in this area of the most intense activity in the timber industry, mining, and shipping. There the peasants were more exposed to the fluctuations of the world markets than anywhere else. They had progressed farther than others in the transition from mere self-supply to cash crops. Therefore the post-war depression of the 1780's fell upon them with particular incidence. And in the person of the progressive peasant Christian Jensen Lofthuus (1750-1797) they found a capable leader, who by his willingness to assume responsibility and personal risks inspired devotion and courage.³⁵ Frequently during the years 1784-1786 the peasants from these districts sent formal petitions down to Copenhagen against the grafting administrators and the grasping bourgeoisie, and finally, in June, 1786, Lofthuus himself appeared there as a private citizen to complain to the crown prince. The latter received him kindly but dismissed him with words which Lofthuus interpreted to mean that before his petition could be seriously considered he must present evidence that he was supported by public opinion at home. Upon his return, therefore, he energetically proceeded to arouse his neighbors, knowing full well, however, that in doing so he contravened the letter of the law. But the Crown, he reasoned, was above the law, and from the Crown he fancied that his mandate came. When the local officials failed in an attempt to arrest him, the peasants flocked to his standard, and in October the authorities were met with a defiance little short of armed rebellion.

Encouraged by the spirit of his followers, Lofthuus planned a large delegation to accompany him to Copenhagen. Early in November he arrived in Helsingborg with thirty companions, representative of the peasantry in the provinces of Nedenes and Bratsberg. Receiving news there of the government's order for his arrest, he dared not go in person to the capital, and before the special permit which his companions secured could reach him he had returned to his own mountains. His friends sheltered him from the authorities. He was provided with a bodyguard, and the townsmen lived in daily fear of assault. But on March 15, 1787, he was overpowered and sent to the fortress Akershus in Oslo. The news of his seizure provoked the peasants to fury and they assembled in large numbers when the symbol (*budstikken*) was sent out. The authorities had to employ mercenary troops to disperse them, and, deprived of leadership, the peasants were forced to submit. They returned to their homes to nurse a sense of injustice, to meditate upon the alliance between the officials and the bourgeoisie, and to perpetuate the memory of Christian Lofthuus. Judicial proceedings against the latter dragged on until 1799, when the supreme court fixed his sentence at life imprisonment. Two years before that the defendant had died, having spent ten years chained to the same block. In prison he was the object of much curiosity: Bernt Anker, the grand nabob of the Norwegian bourgeoisie, could hardly find words vile enough to describe him, and wrote that the only reason he might have for wanting to see him would be to spit in his face.³⁶ Mary Godwin, however, desired to see the champion of liberty.³⁷ Some time after his burial there was erected on his grave one night a plank with the following inscription:

A grisly memorial to Christian Lofthuus
 Who undertook to champion the cause of the Oppressed
 But, being untutored in the Law, came to grips with Authority,
 Was bound with chains forged to a block, and so,
 As a prisoner of the State, was held for ten years,
 Without benefit of trial.
 Martyr! Thy freed spirit will meet many kindred souls,
 Who suffered, because they too meant well.³⁸

In spite of apparent defeat, the Lofthuus rising led to a series of minor reforms. The Commission of Inquiry upheld

the peasants in many of their complaints, especially in the matter of the Danish grain monopoly, which was finally abolished in 1788. Furthermore, though many officials were rewarded for their activities in suppressing the movement, several were discharged or transferred, either because they were proved guilty of the peasants' charges or because they were compromised beyond further usefulness. Improved regulations concerning fees were issued and certain minor administrative changes were made.

But Lofthuus became almost more important in death than in life as a symbol of the cause. When a food shortage occurred again about 1795, owing partly to poor crops but even more to the merchants' export of meats and fats to the continental armies, an activity which brought misery to the urban working classes, riots were frequently conducted under the slogan "One for all and all for one," and memory of the prisoner in Akershus revived.³⁹ And when, in the 1830's, the Norwegian peasantry began in dead earnest their march toward political power, the almost legendary figure of Christian Lofthuus seemed always in the van.⁴⁰

The domination of the royal officials, allied with the landlords and the capitalists, was never so hotly disputed in Denmark as in Norway. In 1660, the young and pushful bourgeoisie of Copenhagen had helped Frederick II to shove the decrepit national nobility, long the ruling class of Denmark, over the brink of the political precipice. A new constitution, the Monarchial Ordinance (*Kongeloven*), vesting all power in the king and minutely fixing the succession, was drawn up and promulgated. Absolute despotism was launched. At first the king chose as his chief adviser Peder Schumacher, a burgher of the city, who was ennobled Griffenfeldt. But the bourgeoisie did not long control the government, for although the old nobility disintegrated and for the most part disappeared, a new aristocracy quickly took its place.

Denmark could hardly be expected to keep pace with the western European nations in the growth of modern capitalism and the development of its political institutions. Outside of Copenhagen the kingdom had no bourgeoisie worthy of the name, and the merchants of that city had suffered heavily in the wars. Hence the new land-owning aristocracy and the

German nobles, upon whom the despots preferred to confer high office rather than upon the bourgeoisie, quickly developed into a new nobility. But since capable burghers or sons of burghers were frequently promoted into this rank the bureaucratic nobility of Denmark was, until the middle of the eighteenth century, but little less impregnated with bourgeois ideas and interests than that of Sweden. Actual conflicts and antipathies between these two classes occurred very seldom until then, partly because the economic theories of mercantilism enjoyed the support of both groups, but chiefly because the possibility of a good living by trade was small. Even at the time of Struensee, the State Councillor Ryberg, viewing Danish trade in retrospect, was able to write that

None of the middle class have been able to educate their children to earn their daily bread by commerce, but all have been destined either for the clergy, for the War- or Navy-Department, for the offices under your Royal Majesty's administrative departments, or for employment as petty officials in the other cities and in the rural districts.⁴¹

The bourgeoisie was, therefore, decidedly the weaker. And it expressed its inferiority complex by the pathetic, undignified eagerness with which its members sought the empty honors of uniforms, badges and sonorous titles,—anything to create an illusion of escape into a higher stratum. Actually, however, government in the first half of the eighteenth century was conducted mainly for the benefit of the landed aristocracy. It was in their interest that the Danish grain monopoly in southern Norway was established (1737) and the peasant bound to the soil. The urban interests were by no means forgotten, for heroic attempts were made to promote industry and trade. Yet even here the initiative was taken, not by an aggressive bourgeoisie, but by academic mercantilistic theoreticians in the bureaucracy.

So much for the bourgeoisie. The Danish peasantry, however, enjoyed no political powers. There was not even the semblance of representation, as in Sweden; and, especially in the eighteenth century, they were in such a state of economic subjection to the lords that the position of the Norwegian peasantry seemed freedom by comparison. They were consequently incapable of even such feeble and unorganized protest

as occurred from time to time in Norway and Sweden. Occasional stormy sessions might occur on isolated manors when the peasants would state their grievances; on rare occasions they might present forcible resistance to the collection of new taxes, for example the special poll tax of 1762; and their right "to go to the king" never entirely disappeared. The kings often averred their sympathy for the peasants and even interfered half-heartedly in their behalf. But the politics of that age Danish peasants neither understood nor shared. Deep down in the vitals of the social system, however, the antagonism between this lowest class and the higher ones seethed like a fermentation. The peasants hated the lords, but almost more their allies the townsmen, the preachers, and the bureaucrats. The upper classes by their very aloofness helped to build up in the peasants that sense of being something apart, which in the nineteenth century was to render them politically formidable.

The dominance by the landed aristocracy was to end, as we have seen, soon after the middle of the eighteenth century. The Struensee period (1770-72) was construed by its contemporaries as one of bourgeois ascendancy. Johann Friedrich Struensee, physician to Christian VII, a king far in dementia praecox, lover to his queen, Caroline Mathilda, was of German bourgeois stock. And the principles which as chief minister, he attempted to realize, were bourgeois to the same extent as similar measures in other countries. His economic legislation was in line with those newer liberal tenets of freedom of trade and enterprise which the wealthier merchants of England and France were busily propagating. He decreed the liberation of the south Norwegian grain trade for a period of ten years; he removed the costly and paternalistic protection enjoyed by Danish industry; he seriously contemplated a separate bank for Norway; he opposed the maintenance of special urban privileges; and he insisted on a businesslike administration of public finance. The men he appointed to office were more frequently than before of the bourgeoisie, but to no small extent this was due to his determination to retain control in his own hands and to the fact that the nobility detested him as an upstart. There is no evidence that Struensee entertained any fundamental antipathies to the nobility, for he procured ducal titles for himself and his right-hand man, Brandt. There seems,

indeed, to be little reason to consider Struensée as a special protagonist of bourgeois interests. He was, after all, but bringing boldly out upon the political arena issues and ideas which had been hovering in the wings for years. Not one thing did he do, or intend to do, to weaken the absolute power of the Crown. Nor did he enjoy the support of the bourgeoisie, even though hatred of him was greatest in the upper and lowest classes.⁴² His overthrow was due, not to the special hostility of the nobility, but to an accumulation of grievances, some on the ground of real interest, some on the ground of mere philistinism. There was hardly a single economic group in Denmark-Norway that did not feel itself threatened by Struensée's restless reforming hand, hardly any popular fetish which he had not ridiculed. In Denmark, at least, there was another reason for his unpopularity. He was a typical personification of eighteenth century cosmopolitanism. Of German birth himself, he made extensive use of foreigners, not because he preferred them, but because his chief regard was talent. The kings before him had done the same, but for a minister to do so, especially a minister who was believed to be maltreating a sane and good king,—that was a horse of another color. Danish national sentiment, long flouted in governing circles, found vent at last in a manner, that could not possibly partake of disloyalty to the absolute monarchy. A court conspiracy was formed which overthrew Struensée and had him beheaded. The unhappy queen was sent into exile.

The regime that followed (1772-1784) was marked by an intensified Danish nationalism which expressed itself, not exactly in reaction against the innovations of the foreigner Struensée, but in pettifoggery and stagnation. Ove Høeg Guldberg, the chief minister, was himself of petty bourgeois origin and smacked of it always. But he was far from representing the special interests of the bourgeoisie. The landlords were the chief beneficiaries of his ministry; the Danish grain monopoly in southern Norway was promptly restored, and, though no Danish government at that time could be entirely insensitive to the demand for agricultural reform, Guldberg's cautious nature protected the landlords from all impetuous action. The mercantilism of the paternalistic-bureaucratic state was restored, as far as possible, and the chief advantage enjoyed

by the merchants was neutrality in the American Revolutionary War. The ultra-conservative economic policies of the period were, however, exposed to criticism, evidence that the Danish bourgeoisie was attaining the self-assurance attendant upon incipient maturity. Freedom was the burden of its demand. Epitomizing this conflict was the literary argument between *Philocosmus* (Martfeld) and *Philodanus* (Guldberg) in the years 1770-1774.⁴³ The participation of the public in politics, even indirectly by way of the press, was not much to the liking of Danish absolutism, however, and Guldberg quickly withdrew the liberties established by Struensée. The government of the reform period (1784-1790) alone welcomed suggestions.

When in 1784, the sixteen-year old Crown Prince Frederick assumed the exercise of his imbecile father's functions it was not so much a new social group to which he turned for support and advice as to the opponents of the regime he displaced. But they happened to be representative of the points of view entertained by the more advanced capitalistic culture of Europe. Since 1772, to be sure, those points of view, charged with economic and personal individualism, had become more natural to Denmark on account of the notable development of commerce and the assimilation that had occurred between urban and rural wealth. The result was that, without any modification of the absolute system, the government became impregnated with the most advanced economic and social theories of the age. Had the new ministers been mere theorists the efforts at reform might have been as visionary and futile as those of Struensée and Joseph II. Fortunately they were men who while serving an idea were serving themselves, men who could measure the validity of proposals by their own experience. While they were abreast of contemporary radicalism, they were practical men of affairs, not mere abstract idealists. They were consequently able to achieve a series of reforms the like of which were not accomplished in any other country prior to the French Revolution. Not even in the 1780's, however, were the Danish bourgeoisie strong enough to man the high offices; even this ministry consisted almost entirely of wealthy landlords. They alone had surplus products to sell year after year, whereas industry was almost negligible and the merchants largely at the mercy of world economic conjunc-

tures. It was natural, therefore, that the primary concern of the ministry should be agricultural reform. But the progressive abolition of commercial monopolies, import and export prohibitions, and burdensome regulations generally was evidence of the ministry's understanding sympathy for urban activities. The culmination of its efforts on their behalf was the remarkably liberal tariff of 1797.

These reforms were effected from above as by an Olympian intelligence possessed of ample authority. There was much discussion in the press, and this of course helped somewhat to shape the government's policies. But it did not act from fear nor under severe pressure. The slogan of the day was liberty, by which, however, no one meant to attack the system of absolutism. It was freedom of speech and press and worship, freedom of economic enterprise, in general, civic freedom and equality, which that generation demanded,—but not an abridgement of royal prerogatives.

III. SCANDINAVIA AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

In all three of the Scandinavian countries economic development, the evolution of social classes, and the growth of political consciousness had by 1789 reached a stage where so world-shaking an event as the French Revolution inevitably must produce at least an intellectual catalysis. The theoretical speculations which formed the stage-setting of that drama dominated the intelligentsia in the North as well as in the rest of western Europe. The Revolution was the object of intense interest, though not of imitation, and its phrases were bandied about as shibboleths. Upon all active intellects its effects were profound.

In 1789 the Danish program of reform was well advanced. The country seemed actually to be achieving without turmoil those essential benefits for which the French were upsetting their political system. Those benefits were, furthermore, the grant of the Crown. The country was, when the French Revolution began, more devoted to Crown Prince Frederick than to any previous ruler, and this loyalty never wavered. He might,—and did—, effectually muzzle the press in 1799, largely because of Tsar Paul's officious representations when the strong and wise minister A. P. Bernstorff was no longer

alive to defend its freedom and Denmark's dignity. He might lose Norway by remaining too steadfastly loyal to Napoleon and lead the armies incompetently; not even the national bankruptcy (1813) caused more than a feeble murmur. Almost the only commentary that is possible upon this phenomenon has been made, very guardedly, by the historian, Edvard Holm:

It is undeniably almost humiliating to read of this blind faith in a prince who really was anything but a political genius. One is tempted to become disgusted at the political somnolence of which it is evidence.¹⁴

Of revolutionary sentiment there was none. Professor Frederik Sneedorff's lectures at Sorö on the political revolutions in Europe in the last three hundred years,¹⁵ conducted 1788-90, were purely academic. Yet insignificant brawls between students and officers, one of which, the "post office skirmish," happened to occur on the day that news of Louis XVI's execution arrived, were magnified by the imagination of an unnecessarily nervous government into Parisian riots. In a strike of Copenhagen journeymen carpenters in 1794 it saw the contagion of French Jacobinism. Actually, although the slogans of the Revolution enjoyed their day in the clubs and in the press, back of them there was no practical motive. The historian, N. D. Riegels, who nursed a personal grudge against the crown prince and his ministers, went so far as to suggest an Estates General to examine the finances; P. A. Heiberg and M. C. Bruun were exiled for their attacks on the aristocracy and on Danish institutions. The former was even escorted out of Copenhagen by a sympathetic mob.¹⁶ But that was all. Nevertheless, on many a young mind the Revolution left an indelible impression. Bishop J. P. Mynster in his memoirs almost used the exact phrase of Wordsworth that to have been young then was "very heaven." Henrik Steffen's father called his young sons aside upon learning of the storming of the Bastille to impress upon them that a new era had dawned. A few years later Henrik himself took part in the "post office skirmish." The great jurist, A. S. Örsted, when old and very conservative, taunted his youthful opposition with the statement that their liberalism was pale beside that which he once entertained.¹⁷

After 1797, when the reasonable A. P. Bernstorff died, the crown prince, quite in accordance with his age, grew more con-

servative, and insisted upon complete recognition of his absolute authority, a tendency which his long sojourn with the army in Holstein served to strengthen. Gradually he filled the highest offices with mere bureaucrats and brought the long series of the landlord ministries to an end. These new men were almost all of a narrowly legalistic type, content to play the role of mere servants to an absolute monarch, men to whom haste was anathema and *paperassière* a delight. The reform program tapered off and with the beginning of the war in 1807 was terminated. When peace was restored, in 1815, absolutism was apparently as firmly enthroned as at any earlier period. Although the ideals of middle-class citizenship had grown very strong, they were not in conflict with Frederick VI, for no monarch ever more completely personified the bourgeois virtues of thrift, industry, attention to detail, and patriarchal concern for his people.

At first glance it may seem strange that the revolutionary spirit was not stronger in Sweden than it proved to be. More than in any of the other Scandinavian countries the intelligentsia there was imbued with the rationalistic ideas of reform and the egalitarianism of Jean Jacques. Sweden has never so properly as then been termed the France of the North; Thorild spoke of her in 1790 as "the nursery of the French" (*fransosernas drängstuga*)⁴⁸ Politically, too, the country was apparently ripe for a change. The years immediately preceding 1789 witnessed a consolidation of the non-noble estates against the nobility, and in that very year Gustav III with their assistance clipped the wings of the "well born."⁴⁹ The virtual absolutism which he then established depended upon the consent of the middle classes, the very group which led France into revolt. The administration was reorganized so as to insure its dependence upon and obedience to the king. The Council of the Realm (*riksrådet*), which for centuries had occupied a position next to the throne, which on many occasions had successfully opposed the king himself, and to which only the highest nobility had access, was dismissed. Thus disappeared the visible symbol of a whole era of Swedish history. The judicial functions of the Council were transferred to a supreme court on which the noble and non-noble estates were equally represented. Its administrative functions were delegated to a sort of

cabinet consisting of secretaries of state, whether noble or non-noble. The king might get advice from several agencies, but none of them possessed the authority formerly enjoyed by the Council of the Realm; therefore the whole administrative system became almost abjectly subservient to him.⁵⁰

For the *coup d'état* of 1789 the nobility never forgave Gustav III. They sullenly absented themselves from the court as much as possible. They made him the object of malicious gossip. There was even secret talk of a counter-revolution. More than others they rejoiced in the news from France. Several of them had fought in the American Revolutionary War.⁵¹ Count Axel Von Fersen, Jr., and Admiral Kurt von Stedingk were both members of the American Order of the Cincinnati, the insignia of which, however, Gustav III forbade them to wear because it was proof of the possible success of revolution.⁵² The struggle of the "virtuous Americans" for independence had made a great impression on liberal minds, and the American constitution was published in translation. When the French Revolution began the mild radicals in Sweden—chiefly students, literary men, and elements in the disgruntled nobility—hailed it with acclaim.⁵³ The true significance of the French Revolution neither the nobility nor the king could comprehend. The former saw in it what they wished to see, namely a salutary reduction of royal powers which would enable the aristocracy to resume their rightful role in government; Gustav III viewed it as an attack upon the very fundamentals of monarchical institutions. In reality the French middle classes were doing for themselves, because Louis XVI refused to help them, what Gustav III had been forced to help them to do in Sweden, and in helping them had vastly strengthened his own position,—they were placing themselves on a plane of civic equality with the formerly privileged classes.⁵⁴ In alarm, the king, on February 7, 1790, forbade newspapers and journals to carry news of the events in France, a measure which, of course, did not hinder those who were interested from securing information.

In spite of the wide spread of this interest, however, it was hardly less platonic than that in Denmark-Norway. The king's secret police failed to uncover any plots. Even when the war with Russia had necessitated the issue of bank notes to such an

extent that by early 1792 a *riksdag* was reluctantly called to refund the national debt and balance the budget, the king by skilful manipulation assured himself majorities in the three non-noble Estates; and in spite of ominous rumblings in the chamber of the nobility, a *riksdag* which might have repeated the performance of the Estates General in France obediently did his bidding. When Gustav III, at a masquerade ball on the evening of March 16, 1792, was shot and mortally wounded, the deed was performed, not by Swedish Jacobins, but by a small cabal of desperate young noblemen. The rising of the nobility which they had expected to follow failed to materialize.

For a few months in 1792 the regent, Duke Charles, later Charles XIII, who had always sympathized more with the nobility than with his dominant brother, pursued a policy of liberalism. The press was freed again, and in consonance with the optimistic spirit of reform prevailing in Europe before the deposition of Louis XVI, measures were proposed in journals and pamphlets looking toward a bicameral legislature of the American and French type. The discussion became lively; the sympathizers with the Revolution were ardent not only for reform but, using the language of the Jacobin Club, for radical reform; the party which Gustav III had built up, on the other hand, violently opposed all change.⁵⁵ The climax came in December, when Tomas Thorild published a pamphlet employing pompous phrases about the "majesty of the people" and urging the regent to put an end to the system of the Estates. A proclamation was promptly issued, stating that no change in the system of Gustav III was contemplated and though the chief minister, Reuterholm, was a close friend of Thorild, the latter was arrested and exiled. The press was muzzled again, and the regency entered upon a course which earned it universal execration, not because it was conservative but because it was contemptibly narrow and partisan. In 1795, even the Swedish Academy was closed on the pretext that it was promoting Jacobinism.⁵⁶

But, repression or no repression, the great currents of political, social and philosophical thought which were agitating Europe could not be entirely dammed out of Sweden. In clubs and at the universities the progress of the Revolution was

closely observed. The slogan of liberty and equality was popular. The young and very capable Upsala Professor Benjamin Höjer was the center of a group who sympathized with the French Revolution and studied the philosophy of Kant. The old order, placed on the defensive, put everything new, even Kant, into the category of atheism and Jacobinism. More and more, the proponents of the new ideas separated themselves from the old nobiliary opposition to Gustav III, and championed the cause of the "nation," or the "people," against the claims of the nobility to special privileges. Throughout the 1790's the verbal battles between the two factions continued to rage, and the young who were to rule a few years hence were deeply influenced.⁵⁷

The end of the regency in 1796 brought no change in the attitude of the government. Gustav IV Adolf was a reactionary from childhood, and when a group of Upsala students in 1799 hailed the advent of Napoleon he resigned as chancellor of the university. It is interesting to note that at the *riksdag* of 1800 the chamber of the nobility, but none of the lower Estates, divided itself into groups to which the party names of the French Convention were applied, namely "Royalists," "Center," and "Mountain" or "Jacobins." The paramount issue was the question of currency revaluation. The "Jacobin" group in the nobility subjected the royal plan to severe and, as experience proved, justified criticism. What was even more important, they tried to utilize the financial embarrassment of the government to compel it to return to the practice of periodic *riksdags* and to submit to revision of its accounts. It was a statesmanlike program, but the non-noble estates were still too suspicious of the nobility to support it, and even within their own chamber the "Jacobins" were unable to carry the "Center" with them. Gustav IV Adolf did compromise so far as to agree to an annual scrutiny of the accounts of the realm by the representatives of the Estates on the Bank and National Debt directories, who might report to the *riksdag* when the king should choose to assemble it. So far as it went, this was an important retreat from the principle of royal absolutism. Furthermore, the principle of popular representation was given an important extension when the chamber of the peasantry was now finally permitted to elect representatives to the directory of the Bank of

the Estates. But this was far from satisfying the young radicals. Five of the "Jacobins" resigned their titles of nobility and several others their offices and seats. The monarchy remained relatively absolute until 1809 and though its foreign policy was disastrous, the economic legislation culminating in the *enskyfte* ordinance of 1803 could probably not have been effected by any other form of government.⁵⁸

In 1809 a group of nobles and officers, several of whom had belonged to the "Jacobins" of 1800, deposed Gustav IV Adolf. His persistence in the war against France, even after Tilsit, was to this group evidence of his madness.⁵⁹ His conduct of the war (1808-1809) seemed to substantiate their contention. By 1809, Finland had been overrun by the Russians, England was alienated, Denmark-Norway was hostile, and Sweden was in imminent danger of invasion from all sides. The king's personal qualities were not much in his favor, either. He was related on his mother's side to the Danish royal family, and exhibited the same bourgeois virtues as his cousin Frederick VI: a strong sense of duty, unmovable convictions, thriftiness, morality, and an intense orthodox religiosity. These qualities enabled him to perform for Sweden a work of economic reform which somewhat paralleled that of Frederick in Denmark. Almost to the very last the middle and lower classes remained his loyal supporters. On the other hand, his stubbornness, foolhardiness, and irascibility were pathological. His closest advisers were subjected to humiliating insults.⁶⁰ It became impossible finally for anyone to work with him. And this was offset by no personal grandeur. Under these circumstances a palace revolution would require only the semblance of a national necessity to be successful. 1809 provided that. Gustav IV Adolf had called no meeting of the *riksdag* since 1800, though the war had entailed huge expenditures. Experts declared that the necessary funds for 1809 could not be raised by taxation; resort must therefore be had to a loan. But whether new taxes were to be levied or loans floated, either at home or in England, the approval and guarantee of the *riksdag* was necessary. This, however, the king refused to seek. Instead he arbitrarily, on June 7, 1809, levied a war-contribution (*krigsgärd*) of fantastic proportions.

The necessity of a curb upon irresponsible royal absolutism

was now universally apparent. Consequently the conspiratory plans which had been simmering in the army since 1807 quickly reached the point of action. A group of officers and high officials in Stockholm were to hold themselves ready to seize the person of the king, and simultaneously initiated troops were to march upon the city. As usual, details of the plan did go somewhat amiss, for there were mice as well as men among the conspirators. But Lieutenant-colonel Georg Adlersparre and Major Karl Henrik Anckarsvärd, both of the western army, first having assured themselves that the Norwegian army would remain quiet, on March 7th raised the standard of revolt. On the morning of the 13th, as the king was preparing to seize the money in the bank, he was overpowered by a group of officers and civil officials led by Adlercreutz, the hero of the defeated Swedish army in Finland. No blood was shed, but Gustav IV was declared deposed and his uncle Duke Charles prevailed upon to assume the regency.⁶¹ The first act of the provisional government was to call a *riksdag*.

When that body met on May 1, it was confronted with momentous tasks. The constitution had to be revised; Duke Charles would certainly be chosen king unless he should refuse to accept the constitution, but since he was childless a crown prince must be selected; and, finally, money and means must be found to defend the country. The constitutional problem was the most immediately pressing.

The provisional government contained representatives of so many diverse political factions and opinions that it was popularly dubbed "Noah's Ark." The same could be said of the *riksdag*. Some few would inaugurate a new Age of Freedom, others would return to the constitution of 1772, a few were willing to continue under that of 1789 provided only that they might secure office. The men who might have made the most valuable contributions—, Adlersparre, A. G. Silfverstolpe, Adlerbeth, and Hans Järta—, men who for years had been urging reform according to the French, American, and English patterns, and leaders in the revolt against Gustav IV,—these men were now undergoing a reaction against their own earlier liberalism.⁶² It was Hans Järta who drew up the broad outlines of the new constitution, but having for some time sold iron

and copper on the world market, he was far now from being a social radical.

1809 was no 1789; it presented Sweden with no "August days," nor did it extend the social revolution that Gustav III and the three lower estates had that year accomplished. The reaction had already set in. Adlersparre's son, looking back upon the events of 1809, characterized the revolution in the following words:

The Swedish revolution was not, as the first French revolution, occasioned by a need to reorganize and recreate society in its innermost parts, to avenge the bloody injustices of centuries, to level social classes and destroy the rights of property; nor was it, like the English revolution of the 1640's, caused by religious oppression and religious fanaticism, probably the surest means of producing popular uproar;—it was produced by a quiet, deeply felt dissatisfaction with one particular phase of the operations of the government.⁶³

Nothing whatever would have been done to reduce economic inequalities had not the peasants insisted. The other three Estates wanted the constitution, including a reaffirmation of their privileges, signed first and declared themselves willing to reconsider the privileges later; the peasants would not sign the constitution before the question of privileges had been settled.⁶⁴ They were particularly interested in securing the equal taxation of all land. From the sixth to the twenty-seventh of June they prevented the definitive adoption of the constitution which the other three Estates had approved on the sixth. The situation was fraught with danger, for with the enemy at the door it was necessary to act quickly and unitedly. Since neither side would yield, resort was finally had, on the twenty-seventh, to Gustav III's method of dealing with the nobility in 1772. The peasants were summoned before the newly elected king, Charles XIII, and severely lectured for their obstinacy. They were in an ugly mood, but they signed then and there. They had, however, succeeded in frightening the other classes, and the very next day concessions were voted by the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the clergy, which assured a more equal distribution of war costs but left the central problem, that of equalizing the land tax, to trouble Swedish society for three quarters of a century.

The period of absolutism from 1789 to 1809 has been

described as merely a break in the evolution of Swedish constitutional monarchy.⁶⁵ Certain it is that after the degradation that the monarchy suffered in the Age of Freedom and the degradation suffered by the Estates after 1789, the makers of the constitution of 1809 tried to steer a middle course. This is all the more remarkable as the universal tendency of constitution makers then, both in Europe and in America, was to weaken the executive power. Sweden, however, had learned to fear both extremes. Though the debates on the constitution of 1809 are evidence of the familiarity of its makers with the best foreign political thought, it remains a fact that the document was essentially an organic product of Swedish history. Patriotic Swedish historians never fail to point out this fact nor to minimize the foreign contributions. The truth would seem to be that Swedish political experience was fully abreast of the times and that the country therefore confronted the same problem as France, England, and America, namely the problem of preventing too much independence in any of the departments of the government. This could only be done by a system of checks and balances. But such a system is essentially negative in character, not positive. It is the practical expression of the philosophy that government is a necessary evil (Jefferson, Rousseau), which was precisely the dominant point of view in the Age of the Revolution. Thus considered, the Swedish constitution of 1809 is a child of its time; in design it belongs to the style of western Europe, though the materials of which it was constructed were Swedish. There were, of course, practical reasons for building it with native and familiar materials. Among them was the supreme need of the hour, a united front against Russia. Thorough discussion of abstract principles would have consumed time and would have divided the country into hostile camps, each with its favorite pedantry to support. Another and no less important reason for the use of familiar phrases and institutions was the desire of the favored classes to avoid a discussion of their privileges on grounds of general principle. Better for them, by far, to let sleeping dogs lie; they were but too prone to be aroused by the noises of a constitutional conflict, as was demonstrated by the movement of the peasants for equality of taxation. That the regime now set up was a class government was frankly admitted by Hans

Järta in 1814: "Under this system of control the bureaucratic aristocracy—of all aristocracies unquestionably the most considerable and most natural — has become dominant in Sweden."⁶⁶

Though the revolution of 1809 had been directed chiefly against royal absolutism, the new constitution left very considerable powers in the hands of the king. Here again the time element was important, for it was necessary to draw up a constitution that the only possible candidate for the throne, Duke Charles, would accept. A strong monarchy, however, was deemed necessary in principle. The king was given complete charge over the administration, the army, and the navy. He might decide questions of war and peace. The only checks upon his administrative powers were that civil officials might be removed only by legal procedure, and that for the expenditure of money the consent of the *riksdag* must be secured. No attempt was made to establish the principle of cabinet government; the king might appoint his own ministers. They were, however, subject to check by the *riksdag*; a constitutional committee was charged with the duty of reviewing the acts of the ministers at the end of each session. If irregularities were then discovered, the minister in question would not be honorably acquitted by the committee, but impeached.⁶⁷ The judicial powers of the king were limited to the right to sit with the supreme court and there to cast two votes. He might also review death penalties and appoint judges, but might not remove them. The king was granted legislative powers co-equal with those of the *riksdag*; he might initiate legislation, in economic matters he was granted very extensive sole powers of legislation, and he was equipped with an absolute veto.

The lack of enthusiasm with which Sweden hailed the new monarch, and the somewhat apologetic manner in which the new constitution was viewed, is well reflected in the words which Bengt von Hofsten wrote home to his wife from the *riksdag*:

However one may turn a constitution, it still remains most important of all to have a sensible and honest fellow as king, and since they are rare it seems to belong to human weakness not to be able to achieve perfection.⁶⁸

The function of the *riksdag* was the essentially negative one of exercising certain checks upon the king. True, it too might initiate legislation, but none of its acts became law without royal consent. Over the ministers it possessed revisionary powers, but its chief prerogative, a very important one, was the framing of the budget and the disposition of the finances. In this realm the king was quite dependent: he might not spend unappropriated funds, he might not borrow money, nor intervene in the management of the public debt or the Bank of the Realm. The power of taxation was vested entirely in the *riksdag*. It is noteworthy, however, that paragraph 109 forbade the *riksdag* to refuse adoption of a budget.⁶⁹

In spite of the criticism to which the cumbersome system of four chambers, each representative of a separate social class, had been subjected since the French Revolution, no change was now made, though a project for complete reform of the representative system was, in no hostile spirit, referred to the next regular *riksdag*.⁷⁰ But this contemplated reform was not made, hence constitutional problems continued to agitate the *riksdag*. Had there been in 1809 a sharper cleavage between the interests of the nobility and those of the bourgeoisie, the four-chamber system might have been abolished for a legislature with one house, or, at the most, two houses. Had the doctrine of laissez faire been thoroughly assimilated, the bureaucracy would probably not have been accorded so favored a position. By 1840 that cleavage had been developed and that doctrine accepted. Had the constitutional revision been postponed until then, as in Denmark, Sweden's constitutional evolution toward modern bourgeois democracy would have been more synchronous with that of western Europe. For in 1809 the old order was re-entrenched. There was sympathy then for the idea of "no taxation without representation," but the golden opportunity of effectuating it was allowed to pass; thereafter the slogan became "no representation without taxation."⁷¹ In the *riksdag* of 1814-1815 the question of representational reform was put away with the complete acquiescence of every chamber except the bourgeoisie.⁷² The constitution maker, Hans Järta, opposed any change unless thereby the ultimate complete fusion of Norway with Sweden could be promoted. Even then he would jealously guard Sweden against the bourgeois spirit

of the Norwegian constitution of 1814. Nothing better illustrates the bureaucratic conservatism of the dominant element in Sweden than the following quotation. After denouncing the "dominance of capital" as the greatest future danger to Europe, Järta continues:

This type of aristocracy is undeniably, unless limited as in England by other forces, the most oppressive and that which most quickly and most relentlessly will destroy a people. Social consciousness, spirituality, morality, and strength of character disappear from that nation in which money alone rules, and whose whole desire and activity are directed toward its acquisition. The power and influence which wealth, especially movable wealth, provides must be limited to negative proportions. It must *restrain* other aristocracy, but must not itself operate as such. As yet the power of money is in Sweden thus limited. The nobility, the military caste, the civil bureaucracy, the educated classes, members of the professions, and the commonalty do in their capacities as Estates of the Realm constitute separate corporations, each with its spirit of independence in which is included either a certain contempt for the commercial class as such or a jealous chagrin at its riches and its boastful luxury.⁷³

Norway lacked an intellectual capital where the French revolutionary ideas could receive theoretical discussion. The press was also very weak. On the other hand, she possessed in 1789 what was much more important,—a powerful bourgeoisie capable of appreciating the objectives of the French middle class. We have seen that the Norwegian business men had repeatedly been denied a bank, a university, and a share in the formulation of economic policy, and that some of them were therefore prepared to negotiate with Gustav III of Sweden. This was the situation in 1789, and the news from France operated as a solvent upon many traditional political preconceptions.⁷⁴ The death of Gustav III (1792) put an end to all these plans. Meanwhile the clubs were centers of political discussion. The younger and socially inferior members of *Halvdans Klub* (Oslo) raised the demand for "the same egalité as in France" and almost broke up the society. At a dinner in Oslo, during the trial of Louis XVI, the English consul, Mr. Mitchell, offered a toast to "liberty, fraternity, and equality." Bedlam broke loose when Jess Anker, well in his cups, boxed Mr. Mitchell's ears; but a majority drank the Mitchell toast.⁷⁵ A biography of Louis XVI was laconically offered for sale

between advertisements of English window glass and Liverpool tobacco.⁷⁶

When the wars began, in 1792, the Norwegian bourgeoisie quickly took sides for England or for France on the basis of their economic interests. Sentiment in the eastern timber-exporting regions was preponderantly sympathetic to England as the market for their product; but wherever fish was exported (Bergen, Trondhjem, and the west coast generally) France was favored, for England bought very little fish.⁷⁷ Mary Godwin found Norwegians about Oslo singing "with great glee, many republican songs, and seem earnestly to wish that the republic may stand; yet they appear very attached to their prince royal . . ."⁷⁸ The interest in the Revolution was entirely secondary to the business of making money, for which Danish-Norwegian neutrality until 1807 created excellent opportunities. But it was to be demonstrated in 1814 that the Norwegian bourgeoisie and the French were sisters under the skin.

The bureaucracy, of course, had little sympathy with revolutionary tendencies. Office was to them what profit was to the merchants. They served what government there was, and though no more averse than the Swedish bureaucratic nobility to constitutional changes affording them greater influence and independence, they realistically clung to the bird in the hand. With the newer political theory they were well acquainted, and it was they who drew up the fundamentals of the constitution of 1814.

The peasantry, however, remained almost untouched by developments abroad. Nationalists and democrats on the basis of class interest, they were now for the first time being stirred to their depths by Haugean pietism, an intellectual movement destined ultimately to vastly strengthen these political tendencies. Unable, however, to take the initiative toward constitutional revision, they remained formally loyal to the king. How eager the government in Copenhagen was to preserve that loyalty is demonstrated by its extensive purchases of grain for distribution among the stricken peasantry during the hard years, 1807-09, and by the fact that, though every other conceivable device for raising money was employed after 1807, the tax burden of the Norwegian peasantry was not proportionately increased.⁷⁹

The separation of Norway from Denmark in 1814 was due to no revolutionary fervor à la France,⁸⁰ but the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy eagerly grasped the opportunity to draw up a constitution limiting the monarchy, and they naturally resorted then to the political philosophy of the revolutionary era in so far as it was useful to themselves as the dominant social group. The disastrous war with England, for which the absolute monarch, Frederick VI, was solely responsible, entailed universal hardship, but was not itself sufficient to sever the ancient loyalties. When the king, however, in the Treaty of Kiel (January 14, 1814) and his subsequent proclamation to the Norwegian people, himself broke the bond of allegiance and "sold" the Norwegian people to Sweden, every social group in Norway was agreed upon the necessity of establishing popular sovereignty, whether Norway was to remain independent or be united with Sweden.⁸¹ On many other questions of fundamental importance the bourgeoisie and the peasantry were in 1814 very much at odds, but their conflicts were somewhat reconciled by the bureaucracy. Although the economic interests of this group identified them with the bourgeoisie, their philosophical convictions led them to grant the peasantry important political concessions. These convictions, so long dominant in Copenhagen, tracing their lineage back to the physiocrats and Rousseau, and represented in America by Jefferson, were embodied in the doctrine that the simple, unsophisticated peasantry constitutes the main stock of every nation.⁸²

That this doctrine actually received more than lip-service in the national assembly at Eidsvold in April and May, 1814, is somewhat remarkable in view of its composition. It was elected by a rather complicated system of direct and indirect voting in the rural parishes, the towns, the army and the navy. The 112 men who constituted the assembly were 54 from the provinces, 26 from the cities, 28 from the army and 4 from the navy. 59 were civil officials or officers, 16 were urban business men, only 37 were peasants. Property owners alone might vote or be elected.⁸³ Nationalistic Norwegian historians have sometimes been quite lyrical in their commendation of the assembly's "representative character." It met as one body; it ate at the same table, peasants and high officials rubbed elbows.⁸⁴ The

truth is, however, that it was aristocratic in so far as neither the urban nor the rural proletariat were represented. Nor was there such beautiful harmony as has often been said; "the veal steak and claret" of the common table were impotent to remove the basic antagonism between the peasantry on the one hand and the bourgeoisie and bureaucracy on the other.⁸⁵

The peasants presented a program embodying the fundamentals of subsequent peasant politics—economies at the expense of the bureaucracy, constitutional curtailments of the latter's powers, freedom of occupation and of trade, the land to be reserved to the bonafide farming class, abolition of all urban privileges and monopolies, and universal military service. The last four demands were directed against the bourgeoisie. So was also the demand for a reasonably adequate representation of the rural districts in the future *storting*, for the constitutional committee's draft proposed to give the townsman five times the weight of the countryman in electing representatives.

Nevertheless, the peasants were relatively inarticulate in this assembly, and in all matters but those in which the interests of the bureaucracy coincided with their own they were defeated.⁸⁶ For it was the latter group which dominated this assembly. This coincidence of interest was particularly great in the matter of urban and rural representation. In the rural districts officials were quite as likely to be elected as genuine peasants; this the bureaucracy clearly perceived; therefore the greater the representation in the rural districts the greater the number of officials in the *storting*. With the aid of the bureaucracy, consequently, the peasants limited the representation of the towns to one-third of the total. Since the urban population was only about ten per cent. of the total, the towns still enjoyed an advantage. Few realized that this policy might, at some future time, permit consolidation of the peasantry to achieve a majority in the *storting*.⁸⁷

The assembly decided that, however the problem of unification with Sweden might have to be settled, the Norwegian people should govern itself,⁸⁸ but "the people" referred only to the economically independent classes, whether in town or country. Thus every male twenty-five years old or more, might vote, in town if he owned a building worth at least 300 *rdlr.* in

silver, or in the rural districts if he had owned or rented taxable property for more than five years. The *storting* was to consist of representatives, elected indirectly, 1-3 from urban, 2-3 from rural districts, every third year. The whole body was to be elected at the same time by the same voters and electors, but upon assembling was to choose one fourth of its membership to form an upper house (*lagting*); the lower house was called the *odelsting*. If the upper house should twice decline to accept a bill of the lower house the *storting* was to sit as one body and a two-thirds vote be decisive. The king was endowed with veto power, but a power so limited as to become merely suspensive, for if three successive regular *stortings* should adopt a bill in unchanged form, it was to become a law without the royal signature. The king might choose his own ministers, but they might be impeached by the *odelsting* before a High Court consisting of the *lagting* and the Supreme Court. The king might decide questions of alliance, war, and peace. He might also, with the advice of his ministers, appoint all civil, military and religious officers. No judge might be removed, except by court action.

The constitution contained all those guarantees of life and property which had been secured by the middle-classes of other countries, notably England, France and the United States. Freedom of the press was established, and it was decreed without significant opposition that no new permanent restrictions (monopolies or privileges) upon freedom of occupation should be imposed. Representative of the opposition was the view of the manager of the Kongsberg iron foundry, Steenstrup, who argued for a seven-year term upon all such concessions, whether new or old; and the iron-master, Jacob Aall, while willing to admit that no new monopolistic concessions ought to be granted, insisted that it would constitute a violation of property rights to terminate those already existing. Aall's view brought into glaring prominence the economic antagonism between the peasants, whose cause enjoyed the support of many office-holders, and the bourgeoisie, for the peasants demanded permission to establish lumber mills on their own properties, abolition of the old monopolies, some, even a prohibition upon the urban timber magnates from encroaching upon the precincts of the peasantry by becoming land-owners via the purchase of

forests. The spokesmen of the bourgeoisie, on the other hand, urged that the question of the old privileges be referred to the next *storting*, and argued that peasants were unfitted for such complicated activities as manufacturing, whereas industrial and commercial entrepreneurs could make genuine contributions to the science of agriculture. As finally adopted the paragraph constituted a compromise between the most extreme demands of the entrenched bourgeoisie and the peasantry.⁸⁹

How is the Norwegian constitution of 1814 to be characterized? Patriotic historians, while perforce admitting that it was primarily the work of the upper classes, have held that "they understood that liberty was the Norwegian people's ancient heritage . . ."

True to those principles, which had been reenforced by the republican ideals of a government by the people and for the people, they chose with unselfish patriotism to make a constitution for the kingdom so truly democratic in spirit that it lodged all power in the hands of the common people, and deprived both king and upper classes of the power of exercising political leadership.⁹⁰

A modern Swedish historian, irritated at Norway's stubborn refusal to be assimilated in the union and at the constitution which effectively hindered that consummation, called it a patch-work of borrowed provisions.

These heterogeneous materials were only in part co-ordinated in the final draft, and even in other respects left much to be desired. To this conglomerate of constitutional injunctions the provisions of the union [with Sweden] had to be attached.⁹¹

Quite obviously neither of these extreme points of view is correct. Much was, of course, borrowed from abroad. It had to be; for Norway had no such parliamentary experience to draw upon as Sweden in 1809. And the remarkable thing was, not that so little co-ordination was effected, but that it was so well effected. Subsequent history is proof of that. On the other hand, the upper classes were by no means so magnificently unselfish as Professor Gjerset maintains. Hans Järta was much nearer the truth when in 1814 he wrote: "The Eidsvold constitution in several places reveals the influence of the merchants. The national representation that it sets up points toward the unlimited dominion of wealth."⁹²

Even this, however, is not the whole truth. Järta failed to see that the very group which he had helped to power in 1809 in Sweden, the bureaucracy, had occupied the center of the stage at Eidsvold and that it had been careful to assure itself a privileged position. The constitution was so framed as to render the bureaucracy and its nearest allies, the bourgeoisie, dominant in the Norwegian state, but also as to enable the bureaucracy, if necessary, to play off the peasants against the bourgeoisie. They certainly neither expected nor intended to word the constitution in such a manner that the powerful forces of a religious movement, economic improvement, and cultural advancement would, without necessitating any change, eventually enable the peasantry to maneuver both the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie into a corner.

The Eidsvold assembly convened in an atmosphere of fervent nationalism, and declared Norway an independent, sovereign kingdom, a decision which, however, it was necessary to modify within a few months. Many factors had cooperated since 1789 to augment the Norwegian national sentiment,—the example of France, the national uprisings against Napoleon, the vaunting prosperity enjoyed by the business interests during the period of neutrality, and then Norway's unfortunate experience in becoming involved in a war with England solely because of her political union with the absolute Danish monarchy. Among the evidences of this growing feeling were the founding of *Selskabet for Norges Vel* (*Association for the Welfare of Norway*, 1809), Norway's luke-warm participation in the campaigns against Sweden, and the appearance of Nicolai Wergeland's book *Mnemosyne* (1811), the first clear literary expression of Norwegian nationalism. Partly to retard this movement the Danish monarchy in 1808 established a virtual vice-royalty in Oslo with Prince Christian August of Augustenborg at its head, effected a *modus vivendi* for the Norwegian trade upon England, and in 1811 conceded the establishment of a separate Norwegian university. These important concessions certainly accounted in part for the absence of any vigorous independence party in Norway. The plan promoted by the Norwegian Count Herman Wedel-Jarlsberg that Norway unite with Sweden found almost no supporters; and Swedish agents tried vainly, during 1808 and 1809, to provoke a Norwegian

revolt against the Danish Crown. Not even the choice of the popular Prince Christian August to be Crown Prince of Sweden (July, 1809) with the name of Charles August weakened the traditional allegiance of the Norwegians.⁹³

The new Swedish crown prince did not long enjoy his honor, for in May, 1810, he died suddenly; and when Bernadotte was elected to the place in August he quickly made the acquisition of Norway the first point of his foreign policy. His military reputation and his diplomatic skill won for his plan the support of Tsar Alexander and of England, but trusting only himself, Bernadotte, whom the Swedes called Charles John, directed a swift campaign against the Danish King Frederick in Holstein, while on his way to France with the other allied armies late in 1813. The result was the humiliating Treaty of Kiel, which ceded Norway to the king of Sweden (January 14, 1814).⁹⁴ News of this treaty and publication of King Frederick's farewell message caused consternation and anger in Norway, and led the Danish-Norwegian Crown Prince Christian Frederick, who had resided in Norway since 1813, to confer with twenty influential citizens at Eidsvold on February 16, 1814. His proposal that he declare himself King of Norway by hereditary right, however, met opposition on the ground that only the people themselves could designate their new king. Therefore the duly elected Eidsvold assembly convened.⁹⁵

The Eidsvold assembly quickly found itself divided into two parties on the question of independence or union with Sweden. The so-called Union Party included many of the most competent members, and derived its support from the south-western districts, whose business connections were mainly English and who were convinced that peace with England and a revival of their business could only be had by acquiescence with the British demand for a Swedish-Norwegian union. Economic interests also largely determined the attitude of the Independence Party. The Bergen representatives feared what might happen to their profitable trade with the northern provinces (*Nordland*) in a Swedish union, and the peasants dreaded the possibility of subjection to the Swedish nobility. It cannot be said that the Independence Party was more patriotic than the Union Party, for most of its members looked for-

ward to eventual reunion with Denmark, and both were determined that Norway should henceforth be a self-governing democracy. But the Independence Party gained the largest following, therefore the assembly voted for independence and on May 17, 1814, designated Christian Frederick king.

The Swedish government, which had imagined that a quick administrative transfer could be effected, was thus confronted with the necessity of conquest. But Charles John was not slow to act. After helping the Allies to overthrow Napoleon, he hurried home to lead his armies against the Norwegians, who forthwith discovered their own weakness in military equipment, experience and leadership. After a few engagements, none of which seriously delayed the Swedish advance, an armistice was concluded at Moss on August 14, 1814. King Christian Frederick agreed to call a special session of the *storting* and to deliver his crown into its hands; and on his part Charles John promised to insist on only such changes in the Norwegian constitution as were necessary to effect a union. Hence the *storting*, which in May had so proudly declared Norway's independence, was in October forced to accept a union with Sweden.

Fortunately for Norway, the European situation was so dangerous to the personal ambitions of Charles John, who feared the same fate as Napoleon's other marshals if the Norwegian war should be prolonged, that he was disposed to accept the Norwegian constitution with but such changes as would enable the Swedish kings to occupy the Norwegian throne. The *storting* was therefore in a position to preserve the principle of popular sovereignty. On November 4, the revised constitution was ratified, and Charles XIII was elected King of Norway. Five days later the crown prince submitted the king's oath to uphold the Norwegian constitution and took it himself. Thus Norway became united with Sweden in the person of the king. Foreign relations were to be conducted in common, and three members of the Norwegian cabinet were at all times to reside in Stockholm to confer with the king on joint and purely Norwegian matters. The king was forbidden to employ the armed forces of Norway outside the kingdom for purposes of offense, and to bring into Norway any foreign troops, even Swedish, except for purposes of defense, although

3,000 men might every year for a brief training period be moved from one country into the other. Finances, currencies, banks, and all purely domestic matters were to be separate, and it was specifically stipulated that administrative offices were to be reserved to the citizens of the respective countries.⁹⁰

At the close of the revolutionary period the absolute monarchy was still firmly entrenched in Denmark. The bureaucracy was thoroughly subservient; the bourgeoisie was content to trade; the peasantry was enjoying unheard-of prosperity on the basis of the new individualistic agriculture. Economic and social conditions made no political change urgent. In Sweden, however, the exigencies of foreign policy had necessitated a constitutional revision at a time when as yet neither the bourgeoisie nor the peasantry was strong enough seriously to challenge the bureaucratic nobility, and further, at a moment when national safety demanded speed. The result was a constitution which preserved the obsolescent four-chamber system of representation, and which borrowed from abroad only the negative devices of checks and balances. The dominance accorded to the bureaucracy, both by the Swedish and the Norwegian constitutions, was probably at the time historically justifiable, for the spread of their economic interests was genuinely national, extending into agriculture, industry and commerce. Both these documents, furthermore, excluded the urban and rural wage-earners from representation. Those who owned the countries were to run them. Events were to prove that the Norwegian constitution was the more flexible, that the popular will could be more effective under it than under the Swedish. This was due to the system of one chamber rather than four and to the greater limitations upon the powers of the Crown. To one who looks only at institutions the Swedish and Norwegian constitutions very naturally appear greatly dissimilar, but upon closer observation it becomes apparent that the same social groups in each country were using different institutions for the same ends.

CHAPTER VII

THE TRIUMPH OF ECONOMIC LIBERALISM,

1814-1865

Be careful, however, that you do not carry your patriotism beyond the bounds of safety; no one will be grateful to you if you do. The fatherland will make progress even without you, you may be sure; but if you had sacrificed yourself for it in this manner it would but mock you, and would not even proffer you a bite of bread as restitution.¹

I. ADOPTION OF LIBERAL ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

During the first half of the nineteenth century the Scandinavian countries accepted the principles of *laissez-faire* as completely as any European country except Great Britain. In the half century preceding, any liberal economic theories among the Scandinavians had been partly derived from experience, partly borrowed, chiefly from the Physiocrats. Now, however, the British doctrines of Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, and McCulloch, rapidly gained headway and soon superseded all others. Smith early became known in Denmark,² and by 1814, in spite of the war-time retreat from the advanced tariff law of 1797, the country was sceptical of paternalism. Sweden was slower to become acquainted with Smith, but the intelligentsia and the official classes adopted his views so rapidly that the *riksdag* of 1823-24 almost enthroned the principles of *laissez-faire*.³ The naive wholeheartedness with which the new economic doctrines were accepted by many Scandinavians is well illustrated in a passage written by the Swedish economist Carl af Forsell after a journey to London, where he visited McCulloch:

What one would be least inclined to suppose is that the principles of political economy, which have been hitherto considered profound and involved, have been developed by the writings of Adam Smith, Malthus and McCulloch to such a state of simplicity, that even the most limited reason can easily understand them.⁴

Norway, enjoying with Denmark the benefits of the liberal tariff law of 1797 and in constant contact with England by way of her commerce, quickly accepted the teaching of the new school. In Anton Martin Schweigaard, professor of political economy at the university and editor of *Den Constitutionelle*, Norway had a very able member of this school. Born and reared in the environment of the export trade and endowed with all of the tradesman's canny realism, he became, although a good conservative in politics, the foremost champion of a tariff for revenue only. But he was too matter-of-fact to become an extremist; with great cogency he criticized certain details of the system. Thus, for example, he was not a thorough-going Malthusian, nor did he subscribe to the iron law of wages.⁵ He never advocated any abrupt changes and unhesitatingly urged that the taxing power be employed to kill the liquor business. His lectures on political economy at the university in 1835 and his articles on import tariffs in 1836 may be said to mark the turn of Norwegian public opinion to the principle of free trade.⁶

The Scandinavian movement to economic liberalism was only part of the general European movement. It is not surprising therefore to find the representatives of the Manchester school and especially Bastiat widely quoted and paraphrased. There is a familiar ring in the arguments of the Swedish finance minister, Gripenstedt, before the chamber of nobles, November 23, 1859, that those who oppose free trade thereby denounce the principle of division of labor and *ipso facto* identify themselves with a bygone stage of civilization.⁷

The Scandinavian free traders were not, however, mere borrowers of English phrases, for it was only the force of economic, social and political circumstances that gave those useful phrases actuality. When the wars were over and the immediate crisis passed, it became painfully evident that henceforth these countries would travel no royal road to sudden wealth but would have to derive their incomes from their own exportable resources. On their home markets these resources, Danish agricultural commodities, Norwegian fish, the timber of Norway and Sweden, neither had nor needed any artificial protection (it was somewhat different with the Swedish and Norwegian iron industries) but would profit highly from tariff

reductions abroad. These unprotected industries were, furthermore, the first to recover from the depression. The industries supplying primarily the home market were either too weak to make any very audible demands for protection, or they were so nicely adjusted to the local market that they could forego protection.⁸ Peasant household production, for example, did not require protection, nor small shop urban industries as long as the old economy of self-supply prevailed, as it did in the main throughout this period, except in textiles. And in 1856 Brace found prosperous cotton manufacturers of peasant origin near Gothenburg who did not fear ruin from rapidly advancing free-trade sentiment.⁹

Ardent free-traders, of course, argued that industry itself would profit if their theories were put into practice. The German liberal publicist, Mügge, found many Swedes (1856) who admitted that the protective duties militated against the adoption of better industrial methods;¹⁰ and the Swedish liberal economist, Agardh, maintained (1853) that even the disappearance of the small, artificially incubated industries, which could exist only under a protective tariff, would result in national gain, rather than loss, provided the capital invested in them could be applied to the promotion of natural industries. Sweden, he felt, should apply her energies to the production of raw materials and farm products and develop factory industries only as warranted by natural resources and markets. Agardh denied that this policy would be a step backward in civilization by comparing the lot of the Scandinavian laborer with that of the English: "Briefly, the Northern laborer does not by reason of his work lose any of his freedom of motion, nor any of his freedom of thought, nor the freedom of his sentiments."¹¹

The industrialists themselves were divided on the question of protection; thus, although some members of the Copenhagen Industrial Society (*Industriforeningen*) about 1857, favored free trade, a majority wanted a moderate degree of protection.¹² The shipping interests and the commercial capitalists of all three countries naturally preferred low tariffs.¹³

The desire of Norway to profit as much as possible from her unwilling union with Sweden in 1814, and the constant eagerness of the Swedish governments to promote the assimilation

of Norway were important factors in the process of eliminating protective features from their trade laws. In 1827, a commercial agreement (*Mellemriksloven*) between the two kingdoms granted reciprocal rights of trade and navigation upon a considerably lower duty level than was applied to other countries. The right of Norwegian ships to carry Swedish products to ports still under the old mercantilistic navigation system was secured by treaties, e. g., with England in 1826. But Norway adopted free trade more rapidly than Sweden, and therefore the Union Trade Law of 1857 was conceived by the Swedish government as the foundation of a future common commercial policy¹⁴ which should result in a closer union; the law also provided an argument for the downward revision of the Swedish tariff which took place that year.

To follow the tariff history of the three kingdoms in detail is quite impossible. Only the larger outlines can be sketched. In 1814 much still remained of the old system of export duties, import prohibitions and high protective duties, and the immediate effect of the economic depression was to strengthen this system. Although as early as 1823 the Swedish *riksdag* adopted a report by its commission advocating a radical liberalization of the whole economic structure, the government was reluctant, and subsequent *riksdags* were more conservative.¹⁵ As a matter of fact, none of the Scandinavian countries ever completely abandoned the protective principle. Nevertheless, once the most alarming aspects of the post-war crisis were passed, agitation for tariff reductions gained strength. In Denmark there were no great changes between 1814 and 1838. But by the decrees of May 1, 1838, and March 13 and March 22, 1844, schedules were simplified and duties lowered as requested by the Estates. That of March 22, 1844, abolished the monopoly of the Asiatic Company in the trade of the Far East.¹⁶ Protection was now subordinated to revenue, which had by 1848 improved so markedly that reduction of rates seemed quite defensible. The tariff of 1838 was shaped by the desire to make a single customs entity of the duchies and Denmark, to offset the Prussian *Zollverein*, and launched the tariff policy of this country on the way to free trade.¹⁷ After 1848, the question of Schleswig-Holstein had no small effect upon the Danish tariff policy. Thus the laws of December 22, 1850, and July 26, 1853,

applied also to the duchies, and that of July 4, 1863, favored them with important protective features which operated somewhat to the disadvantage of Danish industry proper.¹⁸ This law, which continued until 1908 to form the basis of Danish tariff legislation, was, like several other European tariff arrangements, partly inspired by the Cobden treaty between France and England (1860), and marked the ultimate triumph of free-trade sentiment.

Previously, however, in 1857, the treaty abolishing the Danish Sound Dues had removed a very considerable restriction upon the freedom of all trade in and out of the Baltic. This levy by the Danish government upon vessels passing through the Sound, dating probably from the first quarter of the fifteenth century, had long enjoyed some of the sanction attaching to international law. It began, however, to be challenged as a nuisance, especially by the United States, which by abrogating (1855) their commercial treaty of 1828 with Denmark served notice that they no longer intended to pay the toll. The commercial interests of Copenhagen considered it a handicap in their competition with Hamburg,¹⁹ and had (1854) secured the remission of those dues for their ships. The Danish government itself recognized the Sound Dues as an anachronism and insisted only upon a lump sum payment in compensation for the very considerable revenues that would be lost,—almost five million out of a total government income of eighteen million in 1847. Negotiations with other powers led to a settlement, March 14, 1857, whereby Denmark surrendered her right to collect Sound Dues for a final payment of 67,000,000 *Kroner*. The Danish economist, Marcus Rubin, admits that it was "high time."²⁰

In Denmark it was the bourgeoisie and the exporting agricultural interests who favored free trade; in Norway it was the exporters of timber and fish, together with the shipping interests. The Norwegian peasants, at least in the beginning, preferred a moderate protectionism. In all three countries the bureaucracy favored free trade, for they were closely related in ideology and class interest to the bourgeoisie. The attitude of the peasantry, well represented by their leader in the *storting*, Ole Gabriel Ueland, was not determined solely by the fact that they wanted the home market for themselves—this was true of

the grain farmers in south-eastern Norway, but the cattle-raising farmers and the fishermen of the western mountain region were buyers of grain, and Ueland represented a western district—; it grew naturally out of the fact that the rural districts were still preponderantly self-supplying. They used but little that they did not themselves produce, lived strictly within their means, contracted few debts; and they expected the nation to operate its economy upon the same principle. Furthermore the pietistic Haugean religious viewpoint, with its hostility to luxury, softness and extravagance, was overwhelmingly a peasant movement.²¹ It is partly from the peasant point of view that the protectionist tariff law of 1833 must be understood. But three years later the theoretical free trade principle had found an able exponent in Schweigaard; and since the system of representation provided the urban and bureaucratic elements in the population with a delegation in the *storting* considerably out of proportion to their numbers, it was possible to adopt a tariff revision in the liberal sense. The resistance of the peasantry was not thereafter very great, partly because of the gradual breakdown of the system of self-supply in the rural districts, partly because the peasants themselves profited from freedom of occupation and of internal trade, and finally because both as producers of forest products and as purchasers they benefited from fewer restrictions upon foreign trade. With the adoption of the tariff of 1842, the free traders had won the victory and subsequent revisions merely emphasized it,²² though the protective feature was never wholly abandoned and occasionally even extended. Simultaneously the export duties on timber and on fish were gradually reduced and finally withdrawn.

Mercantilism resisted onslaught more successfully in Sweden than in either of the other countries. When the war was over the navigation act of 1724 was still in force, and in 1816 a new tariff law carried hundreds of import prohibitions and over fifty export prohibitions. These were reduced by half in 1824, but the principle remained unchanged. The *riksdag* of 1823-24 endowed the government with power to alter the schedules, and from time to time changes were made, either by the administration or by special enactment of the *riksdag*. Such changes were not however essentially free-trade in prin-

ciple. Oscar I's tariff bill of 1847 was conceived somewhat in that spirit, but the March riots of 1848 frightened him into reaction and the old system continued to stand. Not until the *riksdag* of 1853-54 was there a majority for even moderate freedom of trade, but by this time the agricultural interests, whose attitude heretofore had been determined by much the same conditions as in Norway, no longer opposed a downward revision, and the disintegration of the old industrial and crafts corporations resulting from freedom in occupation and internal trade had removed well-organized opposition to tariff reduction. The widespread prosperity of the 1850's suggested that protection was unnecessary, and Sweden's interest in keeping step with the more advanced Norway seemed to dictate acceptance of the free-trade principle. The bar-iron industry still demanded protection, but the now important textile industry was interested quite as much in low rates on foodstuffs and raw materials. This situation led to the tariff law of 1857, which reduced rates markedly but still retained a few important protective features.²³ The economic crisis in the early 1860's caused a reaction against free trade in the *riksdag* that would almost certainly have been expressed in legislation, but for the work of the finance minister, J. A. Gripenstedt. A convinced free-trader, he negotiated a treaty with France in 1865 which went even farther than the law of 1857 and limited the legislative power of the *riksdag* on this question for a term of years. Since the treaty was already in operation when the *riksdag* assembled, it was difficult to refuse ratification; furthermore, gratitude to the ministry of De Geer for having solved the vexing problem of parliamentary reform inclined that body to accept the treaty. Considering the great advantages conferred by the treaty upon Norwegian shipping it was natural that the *storting* also should accept it, though the peasant representatives resisted slightly on constitutional grounds.²⁴

One feature of the old system which early disappeared in Sweden was the restrictive navigation legislation (*produkt-plakatet*). This was abolished, however, not by legislative repeal but by treaty. Ever since 1783, American shipping had enjoyed freedom from its application, until 1798 by treaty, thereafter until 1816 by special arrangement. The Swedish-American commercial treaty of that year left the navigation

act in force, but granted certain exemptions to American vessels.²⁵ In the 1820's, however, the United States, Norway, England, Finland, and Prussia, countries whose trade was very important to Sweden, engaged in extensive reprisals against her illiberal policy. The government consequently negotiated, before 1830, a series of treaties waiving the *produktplakat* for the ships of several countries. This policy was extended until, about 1850, nothing remained of the old restrictions upon navigation.²⁶ Curiously enough, there was little opposition from the public. The good effects of the new policy contributed not a little to breaking down the faith in paternalism.

The doctrines of *laissez-faire* were applied to domestic economy, as well as to foreign trade and shipping. And internally the chief conflict was between the gild system and the new trend toward freedom of occupation. Now the gild system in its purest form fitted into a society of static castes; but European society had for centuries been developing classes which offered to the individual a constant possibility for rise or descent.²⁷ Scandinavian society had never been so completely stratified as that of other countries, and during the last quarter of the eighteenth century the gild system had been subjected to considerable attack.²⁸ When freedom of occupation was established by law, therefore, it was for all three countries "hardly more than the official approval of its [the gild system's] long continued actual dissolution."²⁹

In the larger Scandinavian cities, to a somewhat smaller extent in the provincial towns, the gild system remained until about 1840 what it had been before. Indeed, the tendency after 1814, especially in Denmark, had been to strengthen rather than weaken its position.³⁰ The gilds had elaborate and mystical ceremonials; fees upon transition from one grade to another were so high as to be a serious obstacle and therefore an effective bar to competition; in some trades the number of masters was strictly limited; and they enjoyed practically monopolistic privileges enforced by the courts. Some gilds served the rural districts, others the large cities. Everywhere they constituted a serious obstacle to freedom of individual enterprise. Morals within the gilds were not elevated by the frequently orgiastic celebrations, nor by the difficulty experienced by the journeymen in rising to the rank of master,

almost a *sine qua non* to marriage.³¹ In search of further skill in their trades, frequently driven by poverty and unemployment, and often by sheer *Wanderlust*, these journeymen travelled about from place to place both at home and abroad, much to the dread of the established part of the population, for they were always a burden and often dangerous.³² In spite of their traditional and legally recognized position in society, the guilds were comparatively few and weak. In 1837, twenty-three out of about sixty-eight Danish incorporated towns had no guilds at all, and the small size of the shops may be gauged by the fact that 3,121 master craftsmen outside of Copenhagen employed only 4,322 journeymen and apprentices.³³ When, in 1857, the Danish *rigsdag* established freedom of occupation, there were 44 guilds in Copenhagen, with 2,902 masters employing 7,373 persons, 134 guilds in the islands (excluding Copenhagen), with 1,825 masters employing 2,614 persons, and in all Jutland only 92 guilds, with 1,296 masters employing 1,708 persons.³⁴ In the 9 largest cities of Norway there were only 46 guilds at the time they were deprived of legal recognition (1830); Bergen had the largest number (14) and Christiania and Trondhjem less than half as many (6 each).³⁵ The strength of the Swedish guilds lay somewhere between that of the Danish and the Norwegian.

The guild members themselves were naturally determined to preserve their privileges. In the Swedish *riksdag*, the chamber of the bourgeoisie regularly had a majority against freedom of occupation. Solemnly and sonorously they inveighed, through pamphlets and memorials, against any relaxation of the "orderly" system.³⁶ There was similar opposition in Denmark and Norway; the stronger Danish guilds were capable of particularly tough resistance.³⁷ But the actively interested guildsmen got valuable support from political and economic conservatives. The guild institution was older than mercantilism and enjoyed far more traditional sanction. It was natural for conservatives to support it. Furthermore, at least in Sweden, poverty was acute from 1820 to 1850, and it was urged that if Sweden should give up the patriarchal guild system for that of modern capitalism, the masses would fall prey to the radical labor movements that were stirring the English workers. The conservative ministers with whom Charles John surrounded

himself obstructed a law removing gild privileges, from 1823 to 1844, although throughout this time all chambers except the bourgeoisie favored such a law. The leader of an important section of the Danish peasantry, J. A. Hansen, himself a former shoemaker, imbued his following with such a dislike of capitalists, whether rural or urban, that they championed the gild system to keep out capitalists.³⁸ Nevertheless, not even such a stronghold of gild forces as the Craftsmen's Association of Copenhagen (*Haandværkerforeningen i Kjöbenhavn*) was able to preserve complete unanimity; a strong minority favored freedom of occupation.³⁹

But the forces of change were greater. Population in all three countries was increasing rapidly; an expanding agriculture made room for some of the youth, but every year a new age-group began to knock at the gates of the monopolized urban occupations. The situation was particularly serious in Sweden, where the lack of employment led to alarming and widespread misery.⁴⁰ A similar, though less critical, condition existed in Norway, where emigration now (1830's) began to drain off the surplus youth, and even in Denmark. Sundbärg's conclusion is as applicable to all Scandinavia as to Sweden alone; "In the face of these enormous masses of young men and women, who *had* to have a living, it was no longer possible to maintain the old narrow restrictions upon the occupations."⁴¹ This pressure of population upon work goes far to explain the almost uniform demand of the peasantry of all three countries for freedom of occupation; furthermore, this class also suffered directly by restrictions upon domestic trade, a condition very closely connected with the occupational problem.⁴² The rapid evolution of a modern capitalistic economy in this period was another decisive factor in the breakdown of the gild restraints; the old framework was bursting from inner growth. By the introduction of machinery new trades arose which did not fit into the gild system, and some of the gild-trades themselves were threatened. Nowhere did the old system offer any effective hindrance to the rise of a new industry; indeed it was only an irritation. Even before the final freeing of occupation in Sweden (1846), certain trades were freed in whole or in part as the need for larger capital than gild masters possessed became evident, and as production on a larger, more

rationalized basis became necessary.⁴³ The introduction of new wares such as machine-made textiles confused the situation for the few remaining merchant guilds, and in Copenhagen precipitated a bitter feud which kept them almost constantly in the courts during the 'forties and 'fifties.⁴⁴ Litigations were frequent, often absurd; and as early as 1822 a Swedish commission on administrative organization advised the removal of guild privileges as a means of reducing their number and thereby the cost of government.⁴⁵ Furthermore, both employers and laborers in the new industries desired the end of the restrictive system. It was no mere coincidence that the Copenhagen Industrial Society and the C. V. Rimestad Workmen's Association were on the same side.⁴⁶ The Danish guilds, including in their membership a large number of German craftsmen, incurred ill will when Danish nationalism asserted itself against Germanism in the Schleswig-Holstein question. In 1848 the German journeymen were driven out of Copenhagen by patriotic mobs led by native journeymen. All these forces the liberal, educated bureaucratic and bourgeois elements found at their backs when they recited the familiar arguments for *laissez-faire*.

Freedom of occupation was adopted at various times in each country. In Norway the *storting* of 1827 passed such a bill, which Charles John refused to sign, and it was not until 1839 that his signature to a similar bill could be obtained. No new guilds were to be established, and existing ones were to die out with those who then were masters.⁴⁷ The Swedish *riksdag*, except the chamber of the bourgeoisie, declared for freedom of occupation in 1823, four years before the Norwegian *storting*. But here, too, Charles John and his conservative ministers delayed final action. In 1846, however, early in the reign of Oscar I, the most important features of the guild system were wiped out, though its vestiges lingered until 1864.⁴⁸ In the year that Norway achieved freedom of occupation (1839) the struggle may be said to have begun in Denmark. When, in 1848, the National Liberals put an end to absolutism and secured control of the government, the outcome was certain, but the Schleswig-Holstein war and a period of reaction in the early 'fifties delayed the final enactment of freedom of occupa-

tion until 1857. It became completely effective on January 1, 1862.⁴⁹

The same forces which demanded and secured for the individual the right to engage in any occupation he might desire, also freed the internal trade. With certain variations, the laws of all three countries provided that to engage in trade within the towns the individual must meet the conditions necessary to securing a license (*borgerskap*) and for trade in certain articles must be admitted to the appropriate gild. In the rural districts it was forbidden entirely to trade in certain commodities, which were to be handled exclusively by the towns; and for the rest trade was restricted to certain licensed rural merchants (*landhandlere*). The former restriction of the peasantry to buying and selling in specified towns had been abandoned in the eighteenth century. With rapidly increasing populations, for whom livelihood must be provided, with the coming of capitalism to agriculture, with the advent of new commodities and a more active interchange of goods, it was impossible any longer to maintain the old distinction between urban and rural occupations. New legislation therefore established freedom of domestic trade; for Norway in 1842, with revisions in 1857 and 1866; for Denmark in 1856 and 1857; and for Sweden in 1846 and 1864.⁵⁰

Few of the dire prophecies concerning the results of emancipation of domestic economy were fulfilled. In Norway the transition was easy and gradual. In Sweden there was some temporary dislocation after 1846,⁵¹ but though the number of craftsmen increased at a higher rate between 1846 and 1860 than before, the rate of population growth was still higher. As a matter of fact it was the new industry, rather than the crafts, which offered the best opportunity for employment, the number of such workers increasing from 1846 to 1860 by 40.8 per cent. whereas the independent craftsmen increased by only 17.7 per cent.⁵² So far as Denmark was concerned, the craftsmen and urban merchants certainly suffered some direct hardships by reason of the legislation of 1857, especially since it became effective during a period of unemployment; but there, too, the rise of new forms of industry and the possibility now of locating certain of them in the rural districts compensated the national economy.⁵³ The gild members promptly adjusted

themselves to the new situation by forming craftsmen's associations (*Haandværkerforeninger*) to protect their mutual interests. They also undertook educational work of a professional and cultural character. Their funds for mutual assistance they retained, and as elsewhere such of these funds as remained at the close of the nineteenth century often became nuclei for systems of sickness insurance.⁵⁴

II. BANKING AND THE FLOW OF CAPITAL

The economic crisis after 1814, together with the deflation of the currency and the flight from the national currencies, left the Scandinavian countries fairly stripped of capital. Had there been a more adequate banking system through which credit might have been extended in that emergency, many essentially sound enterprises might have been saved. As it was, the liquidation, especially in Norway and Denmark, was very complete. Thereafter, until about the middle of the century, the demand for capital was relatively modest and stable. Throughout the world the period 1815 to 1848 was one of but modest improvement; it was not until the discovery of gold in California and Australia that prices began to rise rapidly. Scandinavian business could move no more rapidly than that of the world. The mechanization of industry was slow to develop; handicraft methods prevailed even in the iron industry; the drain on capital for industrial promotion was consequently not as severe as it became after 1850, and finally agriculture, until the 1850's, did not require large sums. The system of self-supply was as yet almost intact.⁵⁵ This explains why it was possible for the Scandinavian countries to do without a modern credit system during the first half of the century.

Thereafter it was different. There was noticeable economic improvement during the early 1840's, and with the expansion of the world's purchasing medium after the great gold discoveries,⁵⁶ a period of hectic prosperity began. At the same time, Great Britain entered upon the course of free trade, ultimately carrying with her most of Europe, a movement which inaugurated an era of great economic expansion. In the Scandinavian countries the highway construction in the 1840's, together with telegraph and railway construction in the 1850's and 1860's, began to call for heavy capital expenditures. Agriculture, about

1850, made bids for capital with which to improve soil, buildings and stock; the system of self-supply was progressively giving way before the capitalistic system of cash crops and wider variation in purchasing. In town and country, especially the former, building activities in the 'fifties and 'sixties were necessitating large expenditures. The Crimean War, and to a less extent the American Civil War, afforded opportunities for profit and emphasized the need for a flexible banking and credit system.

At the close of the Napoleonic Wars the Scandinavian countries each had one national bank, but private and savings banks were practically unknown. There had been a few private banks of discount in southwestern Sweden, the first one founded in 1773 at Stockholm, which had done a thriving business during the inflation period but were ruined, partly by the hostile public opinion expressed in the *riksdag* decision of 1815 to recharter only two private banks, partly by the natural course of the depression.⁵⁷ For several years thereafter the National Bank was in Sweden, as in Norway and Denmark, the only banking institution in the country. These national banks were primarily banks of issue and regulators of currency, not business banks. Nevertheless they were compelled in the absence of other effective distributors of capital to make loans; but partly by reason of inexperience, partly because of the relatively backward stage of Scandinavian development, these loans were for the most part granted to owners of farms or real estate for long terms, and therefore tended to endanger the liquidity and flexibility necessary in a currency regulating bank.⁵⁸ This was especially true in Sweden and Norway. These lending activities were merely incidental, however, and the banks made no vigorous efforts to establish branches, or to extend their operations.⁵⁹ Limited in their functions and obsolete in their technique, national banks were still much the most important banking institutions until the founding of the great private banks in the 1850's.

The national banks did very little deposit business. Fluid capital had before the nineteenth century been in the hands of the governments or a small class of merchants and industrial magnates. The rural population and the lower urban classes had little, and what little they had was largely ignored. In the

rural districts it had been hoarded or put into silver plate or goblets. But with the advent of hard times, the accumulation of capital began to seem supremely necessary. "Now we are all going to save," declared the Danish King Frederick VI. No longer were small savings going to be wasted or despised. It was in this atmosphere that the idea of savings banks took root and flourished. The idea had developed independently in Germany and in England during the last quarter of the eighteenth century; during the second decade of the nineteenth it reached Scandinavia. Savings banks were established in Denmark on the estate of Holsteinborg in 1810, and in Odense in 1816, in Norway in *Søndre Land* in 1810; but the movement to found these banks did not start until 1820. Then, owing chiefly to the work of Jonas Collin in Denmark and C. D. Skogman in Sweden, the first important savings banks were started: Copenhagen, 1820, Gothenburg, 1820, Oslo, 1822. During the next two decades more savings banks were opened, and, though they often led a precarious existence doing a puny business,⁶⁰ they usually managed to survive. With the passing of the money stringency in the early 1840's, progress was more rapid. The rural population were generally distrustful of the savings banks at first, preferring to hoard their money or invest in some familiar object like land,⁶¹ but ultimately they, too, were persuaded to use the banks.⁶² The savings banks began as philanthropic enterprises, which aimed to do little more than invest the depositors' savings in safe government bonds, but gradually, and usually in spite of themselves, they were forced to assume general, if modest, lending and investing activities. Almost always under very conservative management, they successfully weathered depressions and thus helped to overcome the public fear of banks.

There were, however, certain other sources of capital upon which industry and trade, as well as agriculture, might draw. The governments themselves periodically in emergencies lent money directly; in order to do so Norway and Denmark even used their superior credit abroad to secure foreign loans. In Sweden, the role of the state as a source of capital to business was unhesitatingly recognized in the continuation of certain loan funds, which in 1863 disposed over several millions of *riksdaler*.⁶⁸ There were also, in all three countries, certain

endowments, created for the purpose of maintaining churches and schools, poor relief, widows' pensions, and the like, from which loans might be had on occasion.⁶¹ Foreign capital was not before 1850 available in large amount except, as mentioned above, through public credit; but Scandinavian merchants were able to get short-term credit in Hamburg and in London. For the service of mining and foundry works, especially in Sweden, for owners of real estate in the cities, but most especially for agriculture, mortgage associations or credit unions with joint responsibility for the obligations of their members were formed in Sweden and in Denmark. At first the individual associations sold their collective mortgages abroad, but in 1861 the Swedish *riksdag* required them to deal through a specially created central bank (*Sveriges allmänna hypoteksbank*), which for some time sold their mortgages chiefly in German financial centers like Hamburg. Denmark never established such a central bank; in 1851 Norway, however, established a mortgage bank (*Hypothekbanken*) even though there were no local mortgage associations.⁶⁵ Under conditions such as have been described, direct private lending necessarily played a larger role than it does today. The merchants were more willing and able to engage their capital in this manner than any other class, and were strategically well situated to function as agents for the import and export of capital.

During the 1840's it became increasingly evident, as business improved, that the banking systems must be developed to provide greater centralization and more flexibility. The existing agencies were found to be too few, too strictly limited in their functions, and too lethargic in their methods to satisfy an economic system that was daily becoming more complex. The hectic prosperity of the 1850's raised this desideratum to the level of necessity. Though the poverty of the Scandinavian countries, especially Sweden and Norway, prevented them from taking their governments entirely out of the banking business, the prevailing opinion was that the movement of capital ought, to the farthest extent possible, be left to private enterprise.⁶⁶ At the same time private banks were springing up like mushrooms in England and in the United States, and the French *Credit Mobilier* was the sensation of the decade

(1850's). In the business circles of all three countries, therefore, plans for private banks were drawn up and debated.

Ever since 1824, private banks had been legally possible in Sweden, and between 1830 and 1855 eight such banks were founded, each to serve one province through its main office and its branches.⁶⁷ These banks depended more on their limited right of note issue than upon deposits; it was not until about 1850 therefore that their lending activities became important. Furthermore, devoted chiefly to the service of the rural interests and minor industrial establishments, they lacked the resources to function as large-scale financiers. What the country needed, therefore, was a large private bank in the capital which could tap the foreign money market and finance larger undertakings, not only in one province, but anywhere. That came in 1856, when A. O. Wallenberg founded the *Stockholms Enskilda Bank*, largely after the pattern of the banks he had observed in the United States.⁶⁸ In 1848 the *Kristiania Kreditkasse* was founded by F. H. Frölich and some other merchants of that city after the peasant leader, Ueland, failed to secure a nationally owned commercial bank which should not be controlled by the urban capitalists and hence unable to exploit the rural and proletarian population.⁶⁹ The bank began very modestly as hardly more than a pawnshop but quickly found more valuable work to do.⁷⁰ It was followed, in 1857 just before the panic, by *Den Norske Creditbank*, a much larger and more powerful institution. By 1865, there were five private banks in Norway, with a total capitalization of 13,400,000 *kroner*. In Denmark, too, a number of private provincial banks were founded after 1840 but not until 1857 was it possible to establish *Privatbanken* in Copenhagen, under the auspices of the Association of Wholesale Merchants.⁷¹ *Privatbanken*, under the leadership of its young but very capable director, C. F. Tietgen, winning the most immediate and spectacular success among these private firms, plunged at once into the work of financing large-scale railway, telegraph and mercantile enterprises.

With these first private banks, the three most important of which were founded in 1856 and 1857, the banking systems of the Scandinavian countries entered the contemporary capitalistic era. New banks were founded thereafter as needed, sometimes when not needed, and modern methods were

imported, *e. g.* the check system and the clearing house, which revolutionized the work also of the national banks. State owned banks might be created for special purposes but the private banks set the pace. From this time on, furthermore, deposits grew, private banks cheerfully left national banks to issue notes, and the latter, leaving general banking as much as possible to the former, held it their own duty to be prepared to assist them in emergency. A division of work was thus effected.⁷²

The new system was put to severe test almost within a few months of its evolution, by the panic of October and November, 1857. Beginning in America, this crisis passed to England and to Hamburg and then to each of the Scandinavian countries. For all of them the situation was much the same: their business was closely tied into the credit machinery of London and especially Hamburg. The Hamburg system of advancing credit to Scandinavian merchants had been sound and mutually profitable at an earlier period, though it brought a large section of Scandinavian business into a dangerous and humiliating dependence upon the German city. But during the hectic speculation of the 'fifties many laxities and abuses had developed. Consequently, as soon as Hamburg firms and London firms began to totter from the shock in 1857, some of the largest firms in Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Oslo were jeopardized and with them hundreds of others. The private banks, meeting the crisis with energetic initiative, brought the national banks and the business leaders together on bold policies. And they were successful. The panic year is better known in the Scandinavian countries for the failures that failed to occur than for any widespread disaster. One consequence was the greatly enhanced public confidence in the private banks; another was the virtual emancipation of Scandinavian business from Hamburg.⁷³ This crisis is noteworthy as the first of the great capitalistic crises which was particularly noticeable in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark; it may therefore be said to mark their entry into the community of modern capitalistic nations.

The corporation form of business organization was by no means unknown in the Scandinavian countries before 1840; it had been employed to some extent in the mining industry and still more in commerce. But so long as industry, trade and

finance were conducted on a small scale, centralization was impossible. By 1840 in Denmark and 1850 in Sweden and Norway, recovery had reached the point where many individuals in the cities had small amounts of capital that they could afford to risk; and at the same time new inventions and processes required large capital investments and induced a spirit of speculation to which prosperity added optimism, not to say credulity. Then corporations began to be formed. Copenhagen led the way in the 'forties under the leadership of the Industrial Society (*Industriforeningen*). Old, established businesses adopted the corporation form of organization to expand their capital bases, usually with success; new, and sometimes large corporations were formed to undertake the construction of railways, to engage in the brewing industry, or to operate amusement gardens. But in the absence of public control, the less scrupulous elements were able to sell stock in perfectly fantastic enterprises, and the whole activity became almost a swindle. It was the first considerable experience of Denmark with the sacred privilege of *caveat emptor*; so many fingers, itching to get rich quickly, were burned that after 1847 it was almost impossible for many years to sell corporation stock to the general public.⁷¹ Before the adoption of the Swedish law of 1848, the legal status of corporations was uncertain in that country, but thereafter they could be safely organized. The corporation movement advanced there and in Norway more slowly, but with fewer unsound manifestations, than in Denmark.⁷²

A form of capital accumulation and protection which received its modern character in the period between 1815 and 1865, was insurance. The risks caused by sea and fire were the first to receive public attention. One of the oldest marine insurance companies in Europe is the *Svenska sjöassuranskompaniet*, formed in 1740. Denmark-Norway rendered only sporadic maritime protection during the eighteenth century, but in the first half of the nineteenth, local associations were formed which were later federated (*e. g.*, *Det norske Veritas* 1864) and opportunity was given to insure with foreign, especially French and British firms. Insurance against the hazards of fire developed in the eighteenth. The Hamburg system was well known in Copenhagen in the last decade of the seven-

teenth, but not until 1731, after the disastrous fire of 1728, was a similar system set up there. The provincial governors were instructed in 1734 to persuade all their towns to organize insurance societies. Finally, in 1767, a General Fire Insurance Office was established, and compulsory insurance introduced for the towns of the realm. After the separation from Denmark in 1814, Norway continued along the established line until 1845, when the compulsory feature was abolished. In Sweden a Scotch Jacobite and international swindler, John Norcross, proposed a plan for a fire insurance company (1723), which brought the problem before the Estates. After years of discussion, and after Stockholm got a municipal fire insurance office in 1746, a national, state controlled system was established by Gustav III in 1782. Not until the 1840's and 1850's was it possible to find enough private capital to imitate the English system of private fire insurance companies; these early companies were consequently public institutions as they frequently were in Germany. But when the financial stringency abated and when private initiative became the great economic panacea, private companies appeared, almost simultaneously with the private banks.⁷⁰

Life insurance developed out of gild sickness and burial funds, out of philanthropic endowments for the assistance of widows or public pension funds for government officials. Denmark led the way toward centralization in 1795 with the establishment of a state-guaranteed institution, *Den Almindelige Forsørgelsesanstalt* (The General Protective Institution). In the period of speculation before 1807, a great many private life insurance societies were formed, but an adverse government report in 1810 killed all of them. Despite great admiration in Sweden for the Danish state institution, nothing was done until the private insurance company, *Skandia*, began to write life as well as fire insurance. The separation of Norway from Denmark put an end to the business of the state institution in the former country, and chaotic currency conditions were unfavorable to the development of life insurance. But in 1847, the well-known private company, *Gjensidige* (*Mutual*) was founded. Meanwhile, foreign companies were writing insurance in all three countries. The insurance idea was taking root everywhere, even in the rural districts, and there were few risks

in 1865 to which the principle had not been applied if only on a small scale.⁷⁷

III. INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Industrial development was extremely slow until 1840; thereafter it gained momentum. Spinning machinery had been imported from England before the close of the eighteenth century, but had hardly made an impression on the textile industry. In 1814 Scandinavian industry, even the Swedish iron industry, was unquestionably on a very low technological plane, and during the long period of economic depression that followed nothing of great consequence could be done. But with the resumption of specie payments, the improvement of prices, and especially during the boom years of the 'fifties the foundations of a modern, mechanized industry were laid.⁷⁸

Any attempt to introduce the new mechanical processes was confronted at the outset with very great obstacles. Reference has already been made to the scarcity of capital. Norwegian interest rates, for example, were exorbitantly high, especially in the 1830's, owing in part to the currency policies of the Bank of Norway. The domestic market, furthermore, was very limited in each of the three countries. The populations were growing, the age-old system of self-supply had almost all the rural sections in its grip and even retained a footing in the towns. From the vantage point of historical perspective it is clear that in this very period the system was rapidly giving way to modern capitalism, but to contemporaries this was not always sufficiently evident to encourage bold speculation. Even such an article as snuff was often home-made. Commenting on this, Samuel Laing wrote with disgust (1838), "It is got without buying, which is the principle on which society moves in Sweden. It is not to earn, in order to buy—as with our common people; but to do without buying—to want, rather than to buy."⁷⁹ When it is remembered that internal means of communication, and consequently internal trade, was throughout most of this period relatively undeveloped in large parts of Sweden and Norway, it will easily be understood that the domestic market did not warrant much in the way of mass production. Under such circumstances competition on the foreign market was only for naturally endowed industries.

Sombart and Henri Sée have pointed out the importance of colonial markets and commercial capital in the development of Western European capitalism.⁸⁰ Only Denmark and Sweden had colonies, and they were too small to affect their economic development to any considerable extent. As far as commercial capital was concerned, the propitious beginnings made in the eighteenth century had been ruined by the wars and the peace crisis. The almost total lack of coal was at first held to be a very serious obstacle, though Sweden and Norway, at least, were rich in water power. Contemporary commentators, both native and foreign, were also greatly inclined to attribute the industrial backwardness of the Scandinavian countries to congenital psychological weaknesses. This has always been charged when backward areas have turned to machinery, *e. g.* in the recent cases of Japan, China, India, and the U. S. S. R. The employers were held to be lacking in thriftiness, enterprise, and managerial skill; the workers slothful, clumsy, and too prone to amuse themselves.⁸¹ The truth was, of course, that the Scandinavian worker in this period was recruited directly from the rural districts where life was still patriarchal, where regular hours of labor did not prevail and a folk-dance often relieved the monotony of work.⁸² The adjustment from a relatively primitive life close to nature, to the modern machine-disciplined order was not easy. Owners of factories in rural Denmark in the 'twenties and 'thirties could be fairly sure that on a beautiful summer day many of their working people would lay off.⁸³

The agencies by which interest in the new industry was promoted were both public and private. The governments had for long maintained bureaus of commerce and industry, particularly well organized in Sweden, where several public funds were available for the support of special industries.⁸⁴ In Denmark there were several patriotic societies, some of them dating from the eighteenth century, and a few public and private funds. It was the Industrial Society (*Industriforeningen*), however, founded in 1838, which became the spearhead of the new Danish industry. Its leading personality was the paper magnate, J. C. Drewsen.⁸⁵ Many smaller societies were formed for the advancement of special interests. The industrial exposition movement reached Denmark in 1810, Sweden in 1823,

Norway somewhat later. Though interest and attendance varied, the expositions became a permanent feature of Scandinavian life; the stimulation that they exercised is difficult to estimate but undeniable. When the era of world's fairs began in London in 1851 Denmark took part, but not Sweden, nor Norway. The two latter countries had a small joint exhibition in New York in 1853, without Denmark. Thereafter all three were fairly well represented at Paris (1855) and London (1862), and at later fairs. Teachers at technological schools, manufacturers, and workers were often granted government stipends to attend them.⁸⁶

The tremendous interest in popular education, aroused by the religious revival and by the enlightenment during the eighteenth century, took concrete form at the opening of this period in important governmental commissions. Within and without these commissions there waged a bitter feud over the character of education, whether it should be classical and humanistic, or whether it should be realistic and a preparation for practical life.⁸⁷ The sciences of physics and chemistry, it was argued by the realists, had important contributions to make to industry, and the result of their agitation was the establishment of several specialized technical institutions. In Denmark the English Sunday School was introduced by Massman, not for religious instruction, but for drawing and training in the crafts. An Institute for Metal Workers was founded in 1807, and in 1844 the Technical Institute. But the most important Danish institution was the Polytechnical Institute (*Polytekniske Lærestalt*) established under the leadership of the great physicist H. C. Ørsted (1829). Intended originally to be a college of arts and mechanics, Ørsted made it even more a genuine school of theoretical and practical science. Here he trained a whole generation of future craftsmen and industrial leaders and through his public lectures popularized the sciences. Almost every industry from heavy machinery (*Burmeister og Wain*) to brewing (*Carlsberg Bryggeri*) was fertilized by his ideas.⁸⁸ The Swedes were not behind the Danes in the number of technical schools that they founded, but none of them attained the importance of Ørsted's Polytechnical Institute. A College of Mines was established at Falun (1822), the Technological Institute (*Teknologiska Institutet*) at Stockholm

(1825), an Institute of Commerce (*Handelsinstitutet*) at Gothenburg (1826), an Institute of Forestry (*Skogsinstitutet*) in Stockholm (1828), the Chalmers School of Manual Training (*Chalmerska Slöjdskolan*) in Gothenburg (1829). The Technological Institute was destined to become the leading one of these colleges, but not until after its reorganization in 1846.⁸⁹ No such schools were established in Norway in this period, and Tvethe attributed the backwardness of her industry largely to this fact.⁹⁰

In the advancement of technological education the important—though very little studied—role of foreign entrepreneurs, foremen, and machinery must not be overlooked. As late as 1839 it was reported that recently founded Swedish machine shops would have had to import technical labor from England had not *Motala Mekaniska Verkstad*, been founded in 1822, where English mechanics trained Swedish workmen.⁹¹ The growing familiarity with machinery and the systems of technological education led, among other things, to a gradual but steady increase in the number of patents.

An industry for the manufacture of machinery is the prerequisite of other mechanized industries. Sweden, in the eighteenth century, had a very respectable engineering industry, but it was based upon water power⁹² and by 1815 had been entirely outstripped by the developments in England. A Newcomen steam engine, and an Englishman to operate it, had been imported for the royal anchor smithy in Copenhagen in the 1780's, but had functioned badly.⁹³ The Swedish mine at Dannemora, historic as the place where Mårten Triewald's steam engine was set up in 1727, got a Bolton and Watt engine in 1804. The Englishman who accompanied this engine, Samuel Owen, decided to remain in Sweden and set up his own machine shop on Kungsholmen in Stockholm.⁹⁴ He became naturalized and his shops, the Owen Machine Shops, are recognized as the birthplace of the modern Swedish machine industry. Owen specialized in steam engines and steam ships, encountered great obstacles at first, imported a colony of his own countrymen, made a fortune which he lost in later life, and was finally pensioned by the *riksdag* in recognition of his services.⁹⁵ In 1822, when the Göta canal was under construction, the Swedish government established the Motala shops to supply the necessary

machinery. They exceeded the Owen shops in size and filled orders above and beyond those of the government for the canal. At the head of this enterprise was Count Bogislaus von Platen, the builder of Göta canal; among its Swedish officers was Count A. E. von Rosen, who later became the father of the Swedish railways; but its technical chief for twenty-one years was Mr. Daniel Fraser, who was assisted by Messrs. Baird, Malcolm, Thorn, Aitchison, and Jones.⁹⁰ In 1835 there were nine machinery factories, besides Motala, in Sweden, employing in all only 162 laborers; in 1860, there were seventy-two, employing about 3,900, of which about 1,000 were at the Motala shops. The Swedish machinery industry was thus enjoying a fairly rapid development after 1835.⁹⁷ In Denmark the first successful steam engine was imported by the paper manufacturer, J. C. Drewsen, in 1821. In spite of the lack of water power, however, steam was adopted but slowly. Norway had no steam-powered factories in 1829, Denmark but twenty-three in 1839. But in the 1840's, both countries made beginnings in the machinery industry. In 1843, the Holsteiner Hans Henrik Baumgarten laid the foundation of what was to become the firm of Burmeister and Wain, the largest machinery firm in Denmark.⁹⁸

Several factors conditioned the evolution of the machinery industry. In mining there was a constant demand for replacements and improved machinery. The importance of Swedish canal building has already been demonstrated. Transportation by water played a large role in Scandinavian economy, and the steamboat was rapidly adopted, especially in Sweden with its many lakes and islands. The supply of engines and the boats themselves was an essential task of the machinery industry. All of the Scandinavian countries were slow to apply steam power in their factories, largely because they lacked coal.⁹⁹ Not until about 1840 did it become evident that Denmark and Norway, at least, might have coal from the English mines almost as cheaply as London itself; but that discovery made possible steam power and the more extensive use of machinery.¹⁰⁰ The liberation of the timber industry from the old restrictions and its enormous expansion in the latter part of this period led to the introduction of machinery, which in turn reacted favorably upon the machinery industry. Now, too, agriculture began to

make increasingly heavy demands upon it for improved implements and machinery. In the towns miscellaneous machinery was rapidly being adopted, such as printing presses, sewing machines, and laundry machinery.¹⁰¹ All of this in the 'fifties and 'sixties afforded the Scandinavian machinery industry excellent material for growth, but though well begun by 1865 it was then as yet only in its infancy.

The industrial revolution in England and elsewhere in Europe stimulated a tremendous amount of construction work, and prior to the age of steel this created an active demand for lumber. In 1815, the timber industry in Norway was considerably farther developed than in Sweden, though the latter country had much larger forest areas. In both countries the industry labored under certain peculiar burdens. England, the primary market for both, had begun during the wars to import timber from Canada and now favored that import by levying very high duties on timber from other, especially Scandinavian, sources. In both Norway and Sweden, furthermore, export duties were levied, and most heavily in Norway. Finally there was still in force in 1815, especially in Sweden, much of the ancient legal system limiting the free use of the forests.

The very notable development which took place in the timber industry before 1865 was due to several factors. The principles of *laissez-faire* were almost universally adopted; the Swedish iron industry, in the interest of which the Swedish regulations had very largely been placed upon forestry, could no longer dictate forestry policies; disruptive pressures began operating within the timber industry itself; export duties were gradually abolished; and in Norway the peasants demanded that this monopolized industry be opened to them. These facts combined to remove the restrictions on the number of saw-mills and the quantity of their production.¹⁰² Between 1820 and 1850, the state forests and the forest commons (*bygde almenninger*) were mostly sold to private individuals, almost given away, on the theory that government should exercise police functions and not engage in business. A reaction set in against this alienation of public property in Sweden, however, about 1854, and after 1866 the state began to recover forest lands.¹⁰³ Undoubtedly the opportunity to acquire forests easily and cheaply was a great stimulus to private capital. At the

same time, the lower freight rates consequent upon more liberal navigation policies, the substantial reduction of the British tariff on lumber (1842), and the stoppage of Russian exports during the Crimean War created vast opportunities for profits, amply justifying the adoption of improved methods and machinery. Both public and private enterprise helped to clear streams and construct sluices for floating timber. Better sawing machinery eliminated much waste and increased production. But the most important improvement was the adoption of steam power, which made it possible to locate the mills at advantageous points, without regard to water-power. The first steam driven mill in Sweden began operation in 1857. Throughout the whole period after 1830, but especially after 1850, timber exports from both countries increased rapidly, much more rapidly in Sweden, however, than in Norway. For both countries it was the greatest single source of income between 1850 and 1865.¹⁰⁴

To the development of the new Scandinavian capitalism, this industry made very important contributions. Sombart's thesis that foreigners and immigrants are particularly liable to develop into capitalists is well sustained in the history of the timber industry.¹⁰⁵ It was so in Norway in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it proved to be true of Sweden in this period. The Dickson family, who immigrated to Gothenburg in 1808-1810 became first merchants, then the greatest single factor in the timber industry. With the great development in the 'forties and 'fifties, other foreigners entered the field, chiefly English, German (Heffner, Kempe, Bunzow, Rohss) and Norwegian (Jacobsen, Petersen, Astrup).¹⁰⁶ It was in the timber industry, too, that the concentration of capital first attained considerable proportions, especially owing to the sale of the public forests and the introduction of steam power. The ancient patriarchal relations between employer and employee also tended to break down earlier in the timber industry than in others. But there was still another way in which developments here tended to break down the old system and substitute capitalism. A very large proportion of the peasant population was drawn into this industry in one way or another, and since payment for cutting rights, timber land, and wages was neces-

sarily made in money, the system of self-supply tended to disintegrate.

For the iron industry in Sweden and Norway the period from 1814 to 1865 was one of acute crisis and successful readjustment. At first it seemed as though the new English process of smelting with coal and coke must necessarily remove the very foundation of the Scandinavian industry, except perhaps for home consumption. But it soon became obvious that the superior quality assured by the use of charcoal and close attention to technological improvements would still give to Sweden, at least, a foothold on the world market. In spite of the new technology and a sincere wish to be self-supplying, as evidenced by high tariffs, England could not dispense with Swedish iron,¹⁰⁷ though there was a period in the 'forties when the United States took more Swedish and Norwegian iron than Great Britain. However, English manufacturers often purloined Swedish trademarks, with resultant decline in the reputation of Swedish wares.¹⁰⁸ Never as strong as Sweden's iron industry, Norway's was seriously crippled when the separation of Norway from Denmark and her union with Sweden deprived her iron industry of its former safe market in Denmark and laid it open, when the Union Trade Law of 1827 went into effect, to the competition of the powerful Swedish industry. The same fact caused iron foundries to be established in Denmark.

It was a prerequisite to this growth of the Scandinavian iron industry that the old mercantilistic restrictions and regulations should be removed. Adopted to conserve and equitably distribute the charcoal supply and to effectuate a definite price policy, there was no longer any justification for them when coal could be used as fuel.¹⁰⁹ And the prohibitions against the export of iron ore and pig-iron now constituted a limitation of possible development almost solely to the bar-iron branch. Furthermore, the introduction of new methods rendered obsolete the old organizational forms,—regional producers' associations and occupational hierarchy patterned after the gilds. The constant progress of liberal economic theory facilitated the breach with the old system which the new industrial conditions had made necessary. One after another, therefore, between 1820 and 1860, the essential features of the system of regulation and

control were abandoned and the iron industry set free to pursue such advantages as it could.¹¹⁰ In Norway, regulations of this sort had disappeared earlier, but it was still necessary to emancipate the industry from special forms of taxation.

Improved methods were both cause and consequence to the emancipation of the Swedish iron industry. It was evident in the 1820's that English technology quite apart from the use of coal had surpassed that of Sweden and Norway, and in 1829 and 1830, two Swedes, Gustaf Ekman and C. Fr. Waern, were independently introducing the so-called Lancashire process. For the highly decentralized industry to adopt this process took time and depended on improved methods of burning and transporting charcoal. In Norway, however, with its fewer works and relatively more capitalistic production, the profits from the export to America in the early 'forties resulted in the adoption of English methods and machinery.¹¹¹ It was noticeable, in Norway, that the iron-masters who were most likely to introduce technical improvements were those who had recently entered the field by purchasing properties which the depression had forced upon the market. When the Bessemer process for making steel became known, the Swedish engineer, G. F. Göransson made an important contribution to its development (1858). By 1865, Sweden and Norway were again fairly well abreast of the best technology, and were prepared to enter the new "age of iron."¹¹² These improvements made it possible for the iron industry of both countries to increase the volume of their production year by year. By 1860, Sweden had doubled the production of 1830; but no longer did Swedish iron hold any dominating position on the world market. It was plain that its future lay in the sphere of quality, not quantity.¹¹³

In this industry, too, the newer capitalistic methods of organization and work were now gaining ground. The corporation form of association made some headway, the old patriarchal relationship between employer and employee gradually gave way to something less personal, and production increased more rapidly in the larger establishments than in the smaller. The change was particularly marked in the Swedish pig-iron branch, for the bar-iron industry had assumed capitalistic forms in the eighteenth century. The iron industry, however, was still, in 1865, preponderantly made up of small charcoal forges,

and the period following, due chiefly to the building of railways, showed more conspicuous transformations than the preceding; but nevertheless all the seeds of a genuinely capitalistic organization were planted between 1814 and 1865.¹¹⁴ It is worth noting that the only cutlery industry in Scandinavia, at Eskilstuna in Sweden, operated throughout this period, as did Solingen and even to some extent Sheffield, very largely under the putting-out system and with handicraft processes, though the basis of the industry became more and more capitalistic.

The new industry next in importance to machinery was cotton textiles. Woolens and linens had a long history as household products, and though mechanical spinning and weaving gained ground after the middle of the century, they continued to remain household products. Neither woolens nor linens, however, made great progress. It was through the cotton branch that industrial capitalism penetrated the textile industry. In England, in Alsace,—everywhere—, spinning was mechanized first, and the Scandinavian countries were no exception to this rule. Spinning machinery they got from England even before the opening of the nineteenth century, though it was only in the 'thirties and 'forties that the permanent foundations were laid; but yarn still had to be imported in considerable quantities from England. Weaving was mechanized later, and in 1865 there was still a great deal of hand weaving done under the putting-out system. The average annual import of raw cotton into Norway was quadrupled from the five-year period, 1841-45 to that of 1846-50, but the absolute quantity was still very modest (from 299,186 *skålpund* to 1,238,812 *skålpund*). Sweden imported 417,923 *skålpund* of cotton in 1821, 1,832,431 in 1841, and 19,226,177 in 1860.¹¹⁵ The Scandinavian textile industry was, of course, limited entirely to the domestic markets.

The Swedish cotton industry was largely concentrated in the region about Borås, some fifty English miles inland from Gothenburg, and affords the best illustration of the evolution from the putting-out system to the factory system. As early as 1746 Linné described Borås as a busy textile center, operating under an extensive division of labor and genuinely capitalistic principles; and in 1800 it was still operating under the putting-out system. The capital was furnished chiefly by wealthy Goth-

enburg merchants, but gradually some of the local peasants, e. g. Sven Erikson, got a footing and became capitalists on a relatively large scale. Spinning mills appeared, and the first mechanical looms, in 1834. Thereafter the two systems existed side by side, the putting-out system gradually, more rapidly after 1850, giving way to the factory. By adapting their wares to the requirements of the colorful national costumes the manufacturers were able to hold their own against English goods.¹¹⁶ The machinery set up here, as elsewhere in Scandinavian countries, came from England, and with it came skilled workers as instructors and superintendents.¹¹⁷

Until the middle of the century ship-building continued to be mainly a craftsman's trade. The tendency toward capitalistic concentration evident in Norway before the war, disappeared with the altered shipping conditions, and instead of progress in technique there was actual deterioration. Sweden and Denmark built their own ships; but Norwegians often picked up cheaply vessels that were discarded in England. Such ships were passably suitable in the rough timber and fishing traffic, but they reacted very unfavorably upon the Norwegian ship-building industry. It was a common saying that the Norwegians had excellent sailors and rotten ships. When economic conditions improved the demand for ships became greater, increasing to boom proportions between 1850 and 1857. Furthermore, the development of modern marine insurance, both foreign and domestic, exerted a good influence on technique. It set uniform and advanced standards. Smith declares that for the Norwegian ship-building technique the depression following 1857 was of importance in emphasizing the economies possible with ships of good construction, and that the wish to recapture the lucrative emigrant traffic was partly responsible for the Bergen architect Dekke's adaptation of the clipper ship.¹¹⁸ Samuel Owen in Stockholm was the Scandinavian pioneer in the building of steamships; he was followed on a larger scale by the *Motala Mekaniska Verksstad* and by Burmeister and Wain in Copenhagen. Throughout most of this period Sweden not only supplied herself with steamships, but Norway and Denmark as well.¹¹⁹

Until 1860 there was very little change in the organization and technique of fishing. The herring abandoned the Swedish

Bohuslän coast entirely in 1808 and the Danish Limfjord in 1825, appearing thereafter only in Norwegian waters. While other branches of Norwegian economy suffered disastrously from the post-war crisis, the volume of fish exported remained steady in the long run, though subject to great fluctuations from year to year, and the same may be said of prices. This enabled the fishermen to improve their boats and implements, but there were no radical changes. The problem of maintaining law and order, and of assuring all fishermen an equal chance to catch and cure fish was solved by legislation in 1851 and 1857. Two public commissions were appointed; one to consider what changes ought to be made in legislation relative to the Lofoten winter fisheries, and one to propose legislation for fisheries in general on such matters as law and order, rights and privileges, and taxation. The cartography of the fishing banks was begun in 1842, and the cumbersome tithe was abolished in 1845.¹²⁰ In the 1860's capitalism began to move its interest in fishing downward from the mere purchase and export of fish to its actual catching. The Swedes began in the 'forties to use vessels of from thirty to sixty tons in deep-sea fishing, but the Norwegians did not increase tonnage until 1861, though the competition for pilotage had led many Norwegian fishermen to use larger boats and go farther out to sea. The two and three-masted vessels that now came into use could usually be financed only by men of considerable means. The revolution to large scale capitalism in whaling was begun by Sven Foyn's experiments, after 1863, with large steamships and cannon-harpoon.¹²¹

There were many other industries begun or revived after 1840, but which in this period failed to have much effect on Scandinavian economy. Conspicuous among the former were the match and the brewing industries, among the latter, paper and fayence. Copper and silver production maintained their positions in Sweden and Norway. The tiling of agricultural lands gave rise to a considerable clay tile industry, especially in Denmark.

By 1865, however, the transition to a genuine capitalistic industry was in full swing. Access to capital had been provided, private enterprise had been given almost a free field, and the mechanized factory system had been adopted. Statistics

are available only for Sweden in this period; despite their inaccuracies they indicate encouraging beginnings, though everything was still, in 1865, on a small scale. "Each factory," say Agardh and Ljungberg, "now [1860] . . . produces more than *five* times as much in value as in the middle of the last century, and each worker almost *thirteen* times as much as in the years 1739-1746."¹²² Whereas, in 1830, there were listed 1,857 factories with 11,887 workers, there were thirty years later 2,510 factories with 30,757 workers. In the same period the value of the product increased from 8,783,137 *rdr. bco.* to 69,109, 220 *rdr. rmt.*¹²³ The increasing size of the average shop is well demonstrated in these figures. Norway and Denmark were even relatively behind Sweden in industrial development, but there too the trend toward industrial capitalism was unmistakable.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Modern methods of transportation, although nowhere an absolute prerequisite to the beginnings of a factory system, were everywhere essential to its further development. About the middle of the nineteenth century Scandinavia had reached the point where transportation by land and sea urgently needed to be reorganized.

Roads for the conveyance of travellers had been recognized for centuries as a matter of public concern. But it was not until the second half of the eighteenth century that they were seen as important to the movement of freight. Then road building was undertaken in all countries, but administration was inefficient, and the peasantry, which bore the burden of construction and maintenance, was resentful; therefore little was accomplished.¹²⁴ Though foreigners praised the roads in Scania,¹²⁵ they were elsewhere in very poor condition and Scandinavian travellers in England in the 'twenties and 'thirties viewed the macadamized roads there with envy.¹²⁶ The chief complaints were that the roads were too narrow, badly constructed, and, in the mountains of Norway and Sweden, too steep. In the 1830's and 1840's the demand for better roads became irresistible, and after the necessary legislation had reorganized highway administration, extensive construction operations were undertaken in all three countries. The mountains

of Norway presented engineering problems of first magnitude, which were splendidly solved by the chief of the highway bureau, Chr. Vilh. Bergh, though at the expense of large-scale network planning for economic utility.¹²⁷ To what extent these highways, old and new, promoted economic development can not be statistically ascertained. It needs to be noted, however, that overland hauling of freight by the small carriages then in use was expensive and wherever possible—and in all three countries it was usually possible—it was avoided in favor of coastwise or inland water transportation. There were many places where it could not be avoided, of course. The peasants north of Oslo conducted an extensive drayage service for the lumber merchants of that city; and between the termini of internal waterways, especially in Sweden, and in the distribution of goods to the interior, horses and carriages were much in use. Montgomery concludes, however, on the basis of statistics showing the number of horses in Sweden in 1805 and in 1865, that horse-drawn traffic increased but very little.¹²⁸

Sweden had done some very creditable canal building in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially the Trollhätte canal past the falls which broke the navigation between Lake Vättern and the North Sea at Gothenburg.¹²⁹ This canal was, however, but part of a projected system which should link the great lakes in south-central Sweden, and afford a waterway from Stockholm to Gothenburg. Thus the Sound Dues might be avoided. After heroic efforts in the two decades following the Napoleonic wars, the system was completed at public cost in 1832 as Göta canal. Therewith the country's transportation problem was considered solved for a time, and the delay in beginning railway construction has been attributed by a competent authority to the sense of completion inspired by this canal.¹³⁰ Though it carried no small amount of traffic, both passenger and freight, it never vitally affected Swedish transportation. In Denmark and in Norway there was much talk of canals before 1840, but practically nothing was done.

Shipping continued to remain a primary means of communication between points along the extensive Scandinavian coasts, upon the lakes, and with foreign ports. In coastwise and lake traffic the steamboat in this period definitely demonstrated its superiority over sail. Thanks to the machinery

industry initiated by Samuel Owen in Stockholm and to the fact that Swedish waters were particularly well suited to the frail, early steamboats, this type of vessel was quickly and widely adopted.¹³¹ In 1840 Sweden had fifty-four steamboats in service; in 1860 she had 203.¹³² Denmark's first steamboat was the *Caledonia*, purchased in England (1819) and the first steamer in Europe to make as long a journey as from London to Copenhagen, fourteen days. Mechanics for her steamships Denmark also got from England; not until more than a decade had passed did Danes begin to displace them. The *Savannah* visited Norwegian waters in 1819, but not until 1825 did Norway get her first steamboats, purchased by the postal service.¹³³ By 1830 steam mail packets were plying between the principal Scandinavian cities on the North Sea and in the Baltic. Direct packet service between Hull and Oslo and Hull and Gothenburg was established by Messrs. Wilson of the English city in 1852.¹³⁴

But the steamship made no place for itself in Scandinavian merchant shipping before 1865. There the sail proudly held its own. Tonnages in all three countries showed a decided decline during the peace crisis; that of Copenhagen languished until far into the 'thirties, while Norwegian shipping, until 1830, at least, shared the misfortunes of the timber trade, which between 1815 and 1830 occupied from 80 to 85 per cent. of the space in the Norwegian outgoing merchant fleet.¹³⁵ But thereafter recovery set in, proceeding slowly at first, then with more momentum, until at the end of the period, Norway held third place in world shipping. Swedish and Danish shipping also gained good ground, but never approached that of Norway in size and importance. Many factors contributed to this development. For all three countries the progressive liberalization of Scandinavian and foreign navigation and tariff legislation was of paramount importance. The commercial treaties of Sweden and Norway establishing reciprocal freedom of navigation with other countries, the decrees under which Sound Dues paid by Danish vessels might be remitted and the final abolition of those dues, and the British tariff legislation of 1849,—these were of outstanding importance. The increasing activity in the markets of the world and particularly the

Crimean War operated to create a demand for shipping and to raise freight rates.

The Norwegian merchant fleet profited like others from these general circumstances, but was favored in addition by certain special ones. By the Union Trade Law of 1827 Norwegian and Swedish ships were accorded equal rights in the harbors of both countries; simultaneously each country granted the goods of the other preferential tariff treatment. Furthermore the commercial treaties by which the old Swedish mercantilistic navigation policy was nullified stipulated that Norwegian ships might carry Swedish goods as freely as those of their own nationality. These measures vastly increased the possible range of activity for the Norwegian merchant fleet, and 1827 was in a very real sense the turning point in its crisis.¹³³ It was with considerable chagrin that the Swedes who witnessed the disruption of the Union in 1905 reflected that it was Norwegian rather than Swedish shipping which took the profits of carrying the mounting Swedish timber exports after 1840.¹³⁷ Swedish iron was often known in the United States as Norway Iron because it came in Norwegian bottoms. Norwegian ship-owners were able to capture so much of this trade because their operation costs, both for ships and for wages, were rigidly kept down. Furthermore they did not shun, when the great steamship companies elsewhere were establishing fixed traffic routes, to do the meaner work of the world, letting their ships knock about from port to port in the international drayage business which is called the tramp traffic. Their ships frequently remained away from the home port for years at a time. It was with the conscious purpose of inspiring confidence abroad that the *storting* in 1840 made provision for the examination and certification of skippers and mates. The Danish Society for the Promotion of Shipping, founded in 1844, set an example which was to become a Danish tradition when it did the same thing, not by legislation but by societal action.¹³⁸

The emigrant traffic, which for Norway began in the 1830's, contributed not a little to develop sailings to America, and was even considered by the Norwegian emigration commission of 1845 to have made possible the profitable export of iron to the United States.¹³⁹ The ownership of the Norwegian sailing fleet was very democratic. A large proportion of the population

along the sea-coast owned ships, or shares in ships; and it is especially worthy of note that it was particular ships and shares in particular ships that were owned, not stock in shipping companies. Profits in the late 1860's were calculated by the statistical office at an average of sixteen per cent., but since they were divided among a large number of owners, who spent much of the money for consumers goods, speculation was at a minimum and the whole activity produced a notably higher standard of living.¹⁴⁰

What occurred in Norwegian shipping occurred also, but on a smaller scale, in that of Sweden and Denmark. Their provincial ports suffered far less than Copenhagen and Gothenburg from the depression early in the century, for provincial ship owners engaged in no speculative, ultra-capitalistic, long-distance traffic. Indeed, the smaller towns rather gained when those cities lost their dominating positions as entrepôts, being thus compelled more and more to do their own importing and exporting. But about 1840, the Copenhagen merchants, several of whom had experienced the commercial grandeur of the pre-war period, began systematically to try to recover from Hamburg the longdistance traffic of Denmark and the Baltic regions.¹⁴¹ Their success resulted in a splendid recovery for the shipping of Copenhagen.¹⁴² There were no such spectacular developments in Swedish shipping, but it doubled its tonnage between 1835 and 1860.¹⁴³

The appearance of the railway in England was watched with interest in the Scandinavian countries. Travellers wrote descriptions which now give the impression of naïveté,¹⁴⁴ but there was general agreement at first that they could never enter largely into Scandinavian economy. The Baroness von Hahn-Hahn found a miniature steam railway operating in the Copenhagen amusement park, Tivoli, as late as 1842, which was regarded as a great curiosity.¹⁴⁵ For the slow adoption of the railway the lack of capital and the primitive credit system were chiefly responsible. As long as private individuals did not possess capital enough to start railways, as long as stock-markets were undeveloped and banks operating on a no-deposit basis, it was impossible for any agency but the governments to build railways; governments, however, were still pursuing a policy of penurious economy.¹⁴⁶ The obstacles presented by topography

and climate were real, though not unsurmountable, and fortified the general apprehensions. But when railway experts from England, such as Sir John Rennie and Robert Stephenson, son and helper of George Stephenson, pronounced railways feasible even in Sweden and Norway, that argument would no longer hold.

The construction of railways in North Germany in the late 1830's aroused the fear in Schleswig and Holstein that their transit traffic between the North Sea and the Baltic would be diverted; the proposal to build a railway from Kiel to Altona, therefore, received the enthusiastic support of the Danish government and the merchants of Hamburg, whereas Copenhagen business was very much opposed to anything that would profit Hamburg.¹⁴⁷ This line was completed in 1844. In the same year a concession was granted to the Copenhagen Industrial Society for a line from that city to Roskilde. The Society organized a corporation in which stock was easily subscribed, and sold its concession to the corporation; the railway was opened in 1847, and though unprofitable became the beginning of the transportation system from East to West by which the National Liberals hoped to make Copenhagen, rather than Hamburg, the center of the transit trade into and out of the Baltic. The political revolution of 1848 and the Schleswig-Holstein War (1848-51) gave the little country other things to think about, and when the question of railways was taken up again it was under different circumstances.¹⁴⁸

Norway's first railway, from Eidsvold to Oslo, was opened in 1854. The Oslo timber exporters early in the 'forties pointed out the necessity for a railroad, and in 1845 Frederick Stang and A. M. Schweigaard, both representatives of the urban capitalistic interests, secured the appointment of a government commission to study plans.¹⁴⁹ But then the British consul-general in Oslo, John Rice Crowe, requested a concession and offered to raise the necessary capital in England. The concession was granted, and Crowe brought Robert Stephenson over to work out plans; but when the depression of 1847 tightened up the English money market, Stephenson declared that a state guarantee of eight per cent. to the stockholders would be necessary. This the government considered exorbitant and, authorized by the *storting* to enter the foreign market for the

funds to build the road, it negotiated a new contract with the British syndicate, Lewis Ricardo, Sir Morton Peto, and Thomas Brasley. The government agreed to provide half the funds and the right-of-way, and the syndicate half the funds. Robert Stephenson was engaged as construction engineer.¹⁵⁰

Sweden, too, allowed private enterprise, under the leadership of Count A. E. von Rosen, to attempt a solution of the railway question. Rosen, who had lived for a time in England, brought British engineers over to survey possible routes and tried unsuccessfully to interest British capital. Until 1850, he had no more success in finding Swedish capital; but thereafter it was evident that if the state should throw its weight into the construction of railways,¹⁵¹ private enterprise would hesitate no longer.

By the middle of the century, then, the railway problem had, in all three countries, reached an acute stage. Private enterprise had proved unable to solve it; the intervention of the governments was necessary. Each country went about it differently, but with the same ultimate result — government construction, ownership and operation of at least the main lines. In view of the strength of the *laissez faire* doctrine in the Scandinavia of that time, government ownership at first seems strange. And, of course, these countries had their academic doctrinaires. But doctrines have never enjoyed much vitality when in conflict with material interests, and it simply was not in the interest even of private capital that railway construction should wait until it should itself be strong enough to undertake it. There was not then free enough private capital in any of these countries to do the job; railway construction therefore had to be left, at least in large part, either to foreign capital or to the states. As small nations the Scandinavian countries were fully aware of the danger of becoming indentured to foreign capital. Gripenstedt, himself one of the most ardent Swedish exponents of *laissez faire*, posed this problem squarely in a speech before the chamber of nobles, December 21, 1853:¹⁵²

For us it is not merely a question of leaving the railways to *private initiative*, but of leaving them to *foreigners*, and this has, so far as I know, never been done in any of the countries which have been cited as examples.

In the crucial debate on the Norwegian contract with the Brit-

ish syndicate, in the *starting* of 1851, the main argument of the opposition was the fear of mortgaging the country to British capital.¹⁵³ Another reason why railways were cheerfully left to the public was the widespread conviction that however useful they would be to private capital invested in forests, factories, and trade, they would not prove profitable in themselves. But profit is to capitalists the only justification for investment, and the principle of rugged individualism has never been so sacred with them that they have refused to allow governments to do valuable but unprofitable work. Gifts have always been acceptable.¹⁵⁴ Motives of military strategy and of political consolidation—as in the case of Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein and that of Sweden and Norway—naturally seemed to make national railway systems necessary.

Nevertheless, as was everywhere else the case, regional demands and rivalries delayed the adoption of definite systems and principles. In Norway, topographical conditions simplified the problem as to where the lines should be laid, and after the first line was complete in 1854 it was a foregone conclusion that the government would own and operate the railroads.

The Swedish *riksdag* of 1853-1854, adopted the basic principle of government construction and operation of all main lines, whereas private enterprise might, under the strict supervision of the state, function in the field of branch lines.¹⁵⁵ The planning and construction of the state system was delegated to the capable engineer, Nils Ericsson, brother of the inventor of the *Monitor*, and with modifications dictated by political necessity his plans were approved by the *riksdag* of 1856-58. It called for five main lines radiating south, west and north from Stockholm. By 1862, the exact routes had been determined in all essentials, the state was actively borrowing money abroad, and construction proceeding apace. The first line opened for traffic extended from Örebro to Hult, a private line opened in 1857. It is worth noting that Sweden was able to dispense almost entirely with foreign engineers and construction crews.¹⁵⁶

In Denmark, the motive of breaking the dependence of Jutland, Schleswig and Holstein upon German markets played a large part in the debates on the railway question. The National Liberal patriots wished an east to west system with

steamship connections to England; the Jutlanders, eager to preserve their German markets, wanted north to south railways in the peninsula. After a decade of futile discussion, in which the English railway builder Sir Morton Peto had a large part, it was finally, 1860-61, decided to compromise by constructing both east to west and north to south lines in Jutland.¹⁵⁷ On the island of Zealand, railways were built by a private company; in Funen and Jutland they were built by the government, but until 1867 even these were operated by a private company. Thus, in 1867, the Scandinavian countries had adopted basic railway plans, and had practically settled the vexatious question of public or private construction and operation. Construction had not, however, proceeded very far.

Until about 1840 the postal systems remained quite rudimentary. The Norwegian statesman, Motzfeldt, in a letter to Christie written in Stockholm on April 30, 1815, growled that "with respect to the slowness of the mail it is certain that it exceeds all bounds. It takes nine days between Christiania and this city."¹⁵⁸ But thereafter they were quickly and effectively modernized, largely through the agency of the railways. The electric telegraph was studied by the Norwegian government in 1848; and in 1853 Sweden got its first line, (Stockholm-Upsala), in 1855 Norway and 1854 Denmark. All three countries had had optical telegraph systems, but they were used almost only in time of war. The erection of electric telegraph lines proceeded rapidly, and in January of 1855 it was possible for Sweden and Denmark to communicate by a cable under the Sound, jointly paid for by the two governments. Therewith messages might be sent from Stockholm to the Continent via Copenhagen and Hamburg. Norway was quickly tied into this system. When the German-Danish war in 1864 broke the connection of Sweden and Norway with the outside world, except by the circuitous Finnish-Russian line, Sweden and Prussia laid a cable from Arcona (Rügen) to Trälleborg, which was opened in July 1865.¹⁵⁹

V. TRADE, DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN

In the profit system the market is the regulator of production; but the growth of trading activities is a measure of its acceleration. In 1815 the internal trade of the Scandinavian

countries was still in a very primitive stage of development, and as late as 1825 the professors at Upsala were still paid in terms of grain;¹⁰⁰ but the appetite for commodities not produced at home, especially coffee, sugar, certain condiments and textiles, had been aroused, an appetite which now gained sufficient momentum to mark the period as one of transition from primitive, simple consumption to far greater complexity. Here too, however, the great turning point may be placed at about the year 1840. Until means of internal communication were improved, until mercantilistic restrictions upon internal trading were removed, goods could not move freely, nor urban ways of life make headway among the rural population. And the rural population was overwhelming in proportion to the towns.¹⁰¹ Only after 1850 did the towns begin to grow rapidly. Among the country people the system of self-supply was dominant throughout the whole period, though constantly and progressively in a process of disintegration; but to the extent that it remained intact, and in so far as the rural population outnumbered the urban population, an active internal trade was retarded.

Those country districts which had no ready access to towns were often served by specially licensed rural traders (*land-handlere*), whose chief income until the 1850's was frequently derived from the sale of spirits. With the adoption of free trade, the development of an increased purchasing power, and the improvement of communications, these traders multiplied in numbers until, about 1865, practically no farmer was without access to one. The gradual growth of their shop inventories reflected both the increase of the general demands upon life and the ability to satisfy them. The peddler was also an established agency of supply to the rural districts, always welcome both for his wares and for his news of the world without.

The commercial activities of the towns varied widely in degree of development, both as between one town and another and one time and another. In the smaller communities life was very little different from what it was in the country; there the one or two merchants often exercised real economic overlordsip. It was to provide themselves with alternatives and the merchant with competition that the Norwegian peasants favored freedom of internal trade.¹⁰² Practically all trading in

the rural districts and the smaller towns was conducted upon a long-term credit basis; the turnover of goods was slow and necessitated disproportionately large capital investments.¹⁰³ There was little effort to stimulate sales by advertising and an attractive display of wares. Even in cities like Trondhjem, Bergen, and Copenhagen the retail trade was conducted, until the 1840's, in a very primitive manner. The purchaser had to seek the goods. "An Englishman has difficulty in finding the shops in Bergen," wrote Mr. Price in 1826, "and indeed in any Norwegian town, as they are seldom discernible by any external sign; I looked in vain for a shop where I might purchase an umbrella although I had passed the house many times."¹⁰⁴ Shops were not kept open all day in Trondhjem in the 1830's. The whole personnel laid off for lunch at the same time, and if a customer came, the proprietor looked through a peek-hole to determine whether he was worth waiting upon. "Shops were, on the whole, very unpretentious; almost no one went shopping, and it was hardly considered seemly for women to do so. When cloth or similar articles were to be bought, sample-books were sent for and from them purchases were made."¹⁰⁵ In Örebro, Sweden, in the 1840's, a visit to the tradesman's shop was still so much of an event that it was socially required that the proprietor serve his customer a *schnapps*, depending in quality upon the latter's importance.¹⁰⁶ The Swedish economist Forsell, landing in Hull, noted that, "no street in Stockholm, not even Drottninggatan, can, with respect to the number and elegance of its shops, be compared with, for example, Market Place in Hull."¹⁰⁷ When a French victualer, Beauvais, opened a shop in Copenhagen, about 1840, and artistically displayed the goods in his shop window, it required the police to keep the crowds from impeding the traffic.¹⁰⁸

So long as the flow of goods was as meager as it must be under the conditions described, necessary supplies had to be purchased when opportunity afforded and stored away for considerable periods. Even in the largest cities, such as Oslo and Trondhjem, this was the case. Great annual markets and fairs continued to be held, especially in Norway and Sweden, until the steamboat and the railway insured a steady supply of goods.¹⁰⁹ And in the autumn, foodstuffs were laid in for the winter. "It is extremely difficult to get a joint of fresh meat,"

wrote Malthus of Oslo in 1799, "and a pound of fresh butter is an article not to be purchased even in the midst of summer."¹⁷⁰ There had been improvement before 1840, but the quotation may well serve to describe the intervening years not only for Oslo but for almost all Scandinavian cities. The autumn butchering, when meat was salted down and sausages made for the winter, was therefore an inescapable task for the fine ladies of the rich as well as for the thrifty wives of the burghers. Houses in town must provide adequate storage rooms for provender almost as on board ship.¹⁷¹ Slowly but at a rapidly increasing rate after 1850, these rudimentary methods of supply gave way to the improvements of the modern capitalistic system. In 1845 the internal trade of all three countries was decidedly backward in its development, but by 1865 much ground had been recovered, and it was apparent that in this, as in other respects, a new age lay ahead.

Foreign trade increased in volume and diversity as the demand for Scandinavian products grew and as purchasing power developed. Exports changed largely with respect to volume and somewhat with respect to destination. Norwegian fish, Swedish and Norwegian timber, Swedish and some Norwegian iron and copper, Danish grain and agricultural products continued to be sold abroad as tariff policies and other marketing conditions favored. The Swedish machinery industry was able, toward the close of the period, to produce some steam engines and tools for export,¹⁷² but only in insignificant quantities. In the 'thirties, while Great Britain's tariff policy discriminated in favor of Canadian timber, Norway found a market in France which became basic to the recovery of both her timber industry and her shipping.¹⁷³ But when the British duties were lowered in 1842, England promptly resumed her old place as chief consumer of Scandinavian timber. In the period 1825-1845 the United States imported much Swedish iron, and, when in the late 'thirties Norwegian vessels began to carry emigrants, a large portion of Norway's iron went to the same destination. Although after 1845 exports of iron to the United States declined, Great Britain and Denmark increased their demands.¹⁷⁴ The new spirit of capitalistic enterprise which quickly discerns an opportunity for profit, and the progressive integration of western European economy, appeared in the

exploitation of hitherto neglected resources. Thus Norway began, about 1843, to export ice to England and France.¹⁷⁵

Imports, reflecting changes in the technology and raw materials of production and in the articles of consumption, developed far more variety than exports. The use of so-called colonial wares—sugar, coffee, tea, chocolate, spices—had begun in the eighteenth century; but it was only in the first half of the nineteenth century that they entered the regular diet of the masses and thus became necessities. To a generation of administrators trained in the ideals of paternalism and caste this democratization of the luxuries of life seemed dangerous; they were constantly urging frugality upon the lower classes and being met there by a demand for lower tariffs upon this sort of consumer's goods. Beneath the dust upon the pages of the parliamentary debates there is clearly discernible the drama of social ferment. The importation of cotton and coal increased rapidly after 1840, as the textile industry and the use of the steam engine developed. Colonial wares were purchased until about 1850 chiefly through the intermediary of Hamburg under a system of long-term credit. But Copenhagen recaptured a large part of this trade from the Elbe city in the 'forties and 'fifties, and Norwegian, Swedish and Danish vessels began, with better times, to fetch such wares at the producers' own ports. The cheap products of the English textile mills occupied a prominent place in Scandinavian imports throughout the period.

Perhaps the most dramatic development in Scandinavian foreign trade between 1815 and 1865 was Copenhagen's recovery of her position as an important center of the Baltic transit trade. The Napoleonic wars and the subsequent economic collapse had brought to an end the old and profitable business in the wares of the Far East and the West Indies. The great warehouses fell into decay and shipping rotted in an idle harbor. The provincial towns developed their own import and export trade, and travelling salesmen representing firms in Hamburg and in England—*Probenreutere*, they were called—took orders from samples for direct shipment in small lots. The whole technique of foreign trade underwent a profound change to which Copenhagen merchants were long unable to adjust themselves. "There is nothing to be called commerce in the place," wrote

Laing in 1838; "Copenhagen has more palaces in her streets and squares, than ships in her harbour."¹⁷⁶ Both the import and the export trade of Denmark became chiefly dependent upon the Hamburg credit system. There was not capital enough in the country after the debacle to finance its business.

The Copenhagen Association of Wholesale Merchants (*Grosserersocietetet*), founded in 1797, and reorganized in 1817, became the center of all efforts to regain the old independent position. They concentrated their attention on the tariff and the Sound Dues, repeatedly requesting the government to reduce the former and liberate Danish vessels from the latter. The Sound Dues they considered especially obnoxious, because Hamburg's situation enabled her merchants to import goods intended for Denmark and the Baltic regions without paying them, thus putting Copenhagen at a distinct competitive disadvantage. They also urged that the *Probenreutere* be subjected to taxation. Presented at first in the obsequious tone of humble subjects requesting their absolute monarch for his gracious consideration, these demands became more and more stiff as the petitioners increased in wealth and impatience. A noticeable change in tone is evident in the petition of 1831, the year after the July Revolution. The tardiness with which the bureaucrats of the absolutistic regimes of Frederick VI and Christian VIII granted them consideration contributed more than the *Zeitgeist* to the conversion of the merchants to constitutionalism. Finally in 1844, a twenty-five per cent. remission of duties was extended to importers of goods directly from Transatlantic, Asiatic, and African countries, in order to encourage the avoidance of Hamburg and other middlemen.¹⁷⁷ The results were so good that after the inauguration of representative government in 1848, and the intensification of anti-Germanism throughout the nation by the Schleswig-Holstein war, the Sound Dues were remitted in 1854 to Danish vessels.¹⁷⁸ The movement to divert the Danish trade from Hamburg was the easier to carry forward because England's abolition of the Corn Laws opened a potentially larger market for Danish farm products than the German city could possibly provide. The collapse of the Hamburg credit system in the financial crisis of 1857, the construction of railways from East to West, and the war with Prussia and Austria in 1864, all served to divert Dan-

ish commerce westward to England rather than southward to Germany.¹⁷⁹ As a result, especially of the reduction of duties and the remission and abolition of Sound Dues, Copenhagen merchants managed in the 'fifties and 'sixties, noticeably to increase their share in the Baltic trade, particularly that of Sweden. In a deprecatory description of Copenhagen, the German visitor Mügge, in 1856, inquired: "*Wo ist aber hier ein Hinterland, das von der Hauptstadt versorgt wurde und welche sich wiederum durch dasselbe stärkte?*"¹⁸⁰ It was a reasonable question for a foreigner to ask then, but the answer was already known to the Danes. The *Hinterland* was Denmark itself, Sweden and the Baltic. In 1855 ten per cent. of all Danish exports went to Sweden; in 1862 eighteen per cent. And in the following decades Danish merchants under C. F. Tietgen's leadership further strengthened their position as middlemen.¹⁸¹

Thus, by 1865, the Scandinavian countries had adopted the liberal economic principles of an expanding capitalism, freedom of occupation, freedom of trade, and individual enterprise. They had developed modern credit systems and modern forms of business organization. In accordance with the demands of modern capitalism, Scandinavian industries were rapidly adopting a machine technology and the means of communication were being revolutionized. Both at home and abroad the trade of these countries reflected the activity and the characteristics of the dominant middle class, now engaged in economic, political and cultural conquest. To this class belonged the social order of 1865.

CHAPTER VIII

AGRICULTURE: THE NEW SYSTEM

I ought to be a peasant on my own farm. But that would have had to be in olden days when the peasant did not wear himself out for the Jewish capitalists in Hamburg; now I would find no pleasure in a peasant's life either. I was born in a period of transition, in a time without peace, pattern, or home; and furthermore I have broken away from my own way of living into another which has never been mine; this I sometimes feel so keenly that I can hardly restrain myself from sneaking out of the game through some back door.¹

This quotation expresses a bitter disillusionment with the new capitalistic system in agriculture, and is not a complete or honest appraisal. It was not only inevitable, but necessary, that the ancient communal system give way to one which offered greater scope to individual enterprise. Only thus could the improved techniques be adopted by which greater security might be offered to the growing population. Nevertheless, the transition was often painful and the results disappointing.

I. INDIVIDUALIZATION OF THE LAND

The preparation for the important agricultural reforms beginning in Denmark in 1784 has been discussed in a previous chapter. In that year the regime of the chief minister, Ove Høeg Guldberg and the queen dowager was abruptly terminated by the young Crown Prince Frederick and his friends. The men who now assumed high offices in Copenhagen were representatives of the enlightenment to their fingertips,² but they were also practical men of affairs. Count A. P. Bernstorff, who became the leader in the ministry, was himself a progressive proprietor; the same was true of the brothers Christian and Ludvig Reventlow. Ernst Schimmelmann, the finance minister, was more academic in his enlightenment than the others, but belonged to a wealthy Copenhagen merchant and land-owning family. Christian Colbjørnsen, the jurist, was

of Norwegian birth, and a stout believer in individualism. It should be noted also that most of the men were foreigners, either Germans or Norwegians, though they might own estates in Denmark; they were thus comparatively free of local tradition. And, finally, it was important that the Danish-Norwegian monarchy had established a degree of absolutism exceeded nowhere in Europe. The old native aristocracy had been crushed; and the new nobility was composed mainly of the king's officials, either immigrant German nobles or recently ennobled burghers; the church was an obsequious servant; and the bourgeoisie insufficient in number to constitute an effective political group. The monarchy was absolute, and that power resided now in the hands of a sixteen-year old boy, who, though sympathetic and intelligent, must necessarily rely upon his advisers.

As soon as the new government had been established the work of reform began. In 1785 Christian Reventlow secured the appointment of a special commission to administer the great royal estates in the provinces of Kronborg and Frederiksborg on the island of Zealand. Within six years the open field system was broken down, compulsory services almost abolished, tenantry for life changed to hereditary tenantry, and schools established. The following year the so-called Great Agricultural Commission was created, with Christian Colbjørnsen as secretary; it was instructed to study the whole question of the relations between lords and peasants. On its recommendation the decree of June 8, 1787, was promulgated guaranteeing the rights of the tenants before the law, ordaining that neutral appraisal of a property should be undertaken both at the beginning and at the end of the period of lease,—to the end that tenants might be properly compensated for physical improvements,—and forbidding lords to whom personal services were due to inflict cruel and barbarous punishments. On June 20, 1788, the laws binding the peasant to his birthplace were abolished, though a transitional period until 1800 was provided, and a new system of recruiting the army was adopted.

The Great Commission was eager to end the system of compulsory labor if possible, especially as other reforms tended to make proprietors cultivate their lands more intensively and therefore to increase their demands for compulsory labor. But,

unable to find a solution which would be universally fair, the Commission had to rest content with a royal ordinance (1791) stating that the king would look with pleasure upon voluntary settlements of the problem by individual lords and peasants, and meanwhile prescribing regulations protective of the interests of both parties. The result was very satisfactory, and in 1799 a new decree on the subject was issued, which forbade owners of estates to increase the amount of compulsory service. The government never dared to demand the substitution of money payments for personal services, but had the satisfaction of seeing the substitution frequently made by mutual agreement. The personal freedom and dignity of the peasant established by these measures quickly infused him with a new spirit of enterprise. Land again became a valuable commodity, especially as the wars of the French Revolution created an excellent demand for Danish grain and beef. The movement to consolidate strips had been in progress for some time before 1784, and with full government encouragement; but it was not until 1792, when proprietors were permitted to charge their peasants four per cent. of the costs, that it became general. By the opening of the new century most of the Danish land had been consolidated into compact individual farms.³

The demand for capital occasioned by these reforms was very great. Thousands of families had to move out of their village homes into new buildings upon their separate farms; there was an active business in land; and many basic improvements upon the soil were often undertaken in conjunction with the general reorganization. To provide access to capital the state established a loan fund (*Kreditkasse*) in 1786, which within twelve years lent 3,500,000 *rdlr.*, first at two per cent., later at four. It was available to peasants in Norway and the duchies, as well as in Denmark, but was used principally by Danish peasants who wished to convert their tenure into full ownership or hereditary tenure. But for many years farmers were able to borrow from a variety of endowments and special funds and from merchants to whom neutral commerce brought large profits. It was an extraordinarily fortunate coincidence that the reforms were effected at a time when profits in agriculture were high and certain. The rapid inflation of the currency after 1809 only served to increase the boom until anything

seemed possible and land became an object of wild speculation.⁴

The result of liberating the Danish peasant and individualizing the land justified the reformers much earlier than usually falls to their lot. Even the mere removal of the laws binding the peasant to his birthplace seems to have given him a new interest in life. Then came the reduction of the amount of compulsory labor required of the tenants, or its transmutation to fixed money payments, which freed the peasant to work his own soil and made it necessary for him to wring enough profits from it to pay the labor money. An important objective in the government's whole program was to encourage peasant ownership or hereditary tenure of their lands; and as many proprietors, at first from fear of impending disaster as a result of the reforms, later for handsome profits from rising land prices, sold all or part of their estates to the peasants, the latter were given a powerful incentive to consolidate their strips. Upon such consolidated farms they might, and did, introduce better methods in order to pay for their holdings by taking advantage of favorable prices. There were many mistakes at first, but most of them were easily corrected. The most serious error was that from slothful, careless cultivation for mere sustenance the peasants now often went to the opposite extreme and for profits bled their lands white. However, population increased over three times as rapidly between 1787 and 1801 as between 1769 and 1787, and it was especially marked in districts where the transformation of rural society was greatest. The yield of grain increased; the number of cattle doubled from 1774 to 1800; houses were improved, food and clothing likewise. Professor Feldborg of the University of Copenhagen, writing in 1824, commented upon the change which one generation of peasants had undergone:

The men carried themselves with erectness, which in their fathers and grandfathers would in itself have been deemed an unpardonable offense to the lords, who held them by the same tenure as they held other live stock. In their dress the peasants were neat to a degree that betokened easy circumstances and a deliverance . . . from outward badges of slavery.⁵

The process of transformation was by no means entirely completed in Denmark by 1824; there still remained many

special burdens upon the rural population to be removed.⁶ But the most important fundamental legislation had been adopted, and there was no turning back.

Sweden and Norway travelled the same road, though more tardily and slowly. As partial consolidation of strips (*storskifte*) advanced in Sweden, it became increasingly obvious that this offered no real solution, which could be achieved only through complete consolidation (*ensskifte*). What could be accomplished thereby was demonstrated by Baron Rutger Maclean and his imitators in Scania in the 1790's. Consequently the government in 1803 issued a decree authorizing any villager in Scania province to demand the complete consolidation of his property. The next year it was extended to Skaraborg province, and in 1807 to all of Sweden, except Dalarne, Norrland, and Finland. By the latter date knowledge of the benefits of consolidation and freedom from communal routine had penetrated to the peasantry; and thereafter the movement out from the villages became steady, until by 1865 the communal routine and the strip system had for all practical purposes disappeared.⁷

In Norway the sale of public lands proceeded sporadically as the government required money. By 1814 there was little left but ecclesiastical properties (*beneficerede gods*), which according to paragraph 107 of that year's constitution had to be used in the interest of the clergy and for the promotion of education. Mounting sentiment for some years past had favored selling these lands to private owners; such a step had indeed been legally provided for in the rescript of May 19, 1809. Although a reaction set in which culminated with the adoption by the *storting* in 1816 of a bill forbidding sale, the king vetoed the bill and the ministry proposed instead that the lands be sold. The government's bill was not adopted, however, for the *odelsting* felt that the time was unripe for any action. But when, in 1821, the government renewed its proposal, both chambers agreed. How the measure was viewed by the liberal bourgeois elements may be learned by the remark of Jacob Aal: "The liberal spirit which dominates our most recent legislation seeks at every opportunity to eradicate the remains of feudalism and to assure the inhabitants of the country a secure and complete possession of their properties."⁸ After 1821 the sales were encouraged on the principle that private

ownership was socially more valuable than public ownership; and when, in 1827, the regulations governing sales were liberalized, the transfers assumed such proportions that within a few decades most of the public land became private property.⁹ In 1850, there were only about twenty thousand tenants left in Norway. The open field system existed there chiefly in the western districts, where, as elsewhere, it constituted a serious obstacle to progress. Efforts were constantly being made to persuade the peasants to consolidate their holdings, but nowhere in Scandinavia did the system of self supply last longer; nowhere did marketing considerations so little affect the farmer. The profit motive for consolidation was here much less strong because the farms were too small and the soil too poor to produce a saleable surplus. Some progress was made after 1830, as is evident in the reports of the provincial governors,¹⁰ but not until the 1850's with their better roads, their higher prices, and their boom conditions, did the movement become irresistible and final.

In none of the three countries was there any want of resistance to these reforms. Many Danish proprietors felt in the 1780's that the reformers in Copenhagen would bring nothing but ruin to agriculture. They expressed their views with energy in the popular press and in memorials to the king. An attempted organized protest to the Crown Prince, however, netted them only discomfiture. When Crown Prince Frederick married in July, 1790, he received a delegation of Jutland lords who employed the occasion, not only to extend congratulations and assurances of confidence, but to demand that the reforms be withdrawn. They were punished for insolence,¹¹ and the reforms continued unabated. There was less resistance by Swedish and Norwegian proprietors, for they occupied nowhere near the dominating position that their class did in Denmark. It is no exaggeration to say that, so far as the transition from communal to individual agriculture was concerned, the peasants themselves offered stubborn resistance. They were exceedingly reluctant to move out of the friendly village to a lonely, distant habitation. They were fearful lest in the process of consolidation and exchange of land they be tricked out of the full value of their strips,—a perfectly understandable fear.¹² The whole individualization process involved so radical a

breach with the old familiar ways that it took long to effect a complete readjustment. A good illustration of the tenacity of ancient usages was the difficulty of eradicating the notion that to graze cattle upon anyone's stubble was everyone's right. Not until 1837 in Denmark and 1857 in Sweden did the law place upon the owner of the cattle the responsibility for the damage they might do upon another's property.¹³

II. REMOVAL OF SPECIAL BURDENS

The removal of the special burdens under which the Scandinavian farmer labored was slower than the establishment of individual enterprise. It followed logically, however. Democratization of the land resulted inevitably in democratic political activity in the rural districts, and once the peasants had been imbued with the spirit of freedom they became eloquent in demanding equal rights under the law.

One of the most obnoxious burdens was the posting obligation, under which the peasants along the highways were compelled to haul passengers and goods, receiving a fixed fee from private individuals but no compensation from public officials. There were districts in Sweden and in southeastern Norway where the timber and mining industries enabled many peasants to engage more in hauling than in farming, but almost everywhere else the duty was a serious annoyance. The representatives to the Eidsvold assembly in 1814 were careful to trouble the peasants as little as possible on their journeys forth and back lest they arouse political animosity. In 1816 the *storting*, after many complaints, substituted a special tax for the free transportation of public employees; but this measure merely changed the form of the obligation which continued to rest upon the peasantry, hence every succeeding *storting* was troubled with the matter until 1860.¹⁴ Individually or in groups and by their elected representatives the Norwegian peasants made requests and proposals looking toward the establishment of an independent livery service under private or public ownership. With them it was a matter of social justice that the peasantry should not be specially obligated, either to perform services or pay taxes for this purpose. The same was true in Sweden and Denmark. The Swedish peasants forced the issue to the forefront in the *riksdags* of 1834-1835 and 1856-1858,

demanding that livery service be separated from the soil and that it be granted as a concession to private enterprise.¹⁵ As early as 1810 Sweden instituted a feeble experiment with privately owned livery systems, but, though resumed with more vigor in 1844, the old system remained until after 1865, and served to dispose the peasants favorably toward railways. As soon as the provincial Estates began to sit in Denmark, the peasants and their friends demanded a just and rational solution of the livery problem. At the Roskilde Estates of 1835-1836 there was a strong movement to abolish free hauling, or at least to have the obligation levied equally upon so-called "privileged" as well as "unprivileged" land. At both Roskilde and Viborg, in 1842, the problem was thoroughly discussed.¹⁶ In 1844 a decree was issued which limited free hauling somewhat and began the process of substituting money payments for what still remained.

Few of the bureaucrats and bourgeoisie defended the posting obligation in principle. They only argued that its retention was, under existing circumstances, a practical matter of providing regular means of internal transportation. It was hoped that economic progress would cause this business to be assumed by private capital. This was clearly brought out in the debates of the Norwegian *Storting* in 1845. Here a peasant (Soelberg), a teacher (Horn), and an intellectual liberal (Daa) agreed that the existing system was bad, and opposed the bill under consideration because it tended to perpetuate the old posting system. Horn

found that the proposed law would continue a pretty barbarous arrangement and that it harbored an unjustifiable interference with the right of private property. He assumed that the posting system ought not to be regarded as a concern of the state but rather in the main be left to private speculation.¹⁷

In both Sweden and Denmark, of course, there were some who resisted the movement partially to equalize the burden by laying the same duty upon "privileged" as upon "unprivileged" land on the ground that the exemption enjoyed by the "privileged" lands had been capitalized in higher land prices.¹⁸

Only in Norway did the posting problem reach a solution satisfactory to the peasantry before 1865, when in 1860 a system of fixed livery stations was established along all roads and

the peasants were placed on an equal basis with other citizens in providing for their maintenance. Denmark, in 1850, abolished the differentiation previously made between "privileged" and "unprivileged" lands in their obligation to bear the costs of maintaining roads, schools, churches, cemeteries, and the livery service. Not until 1878 did Sweden arrive at an obligatory substitution of private enterprise, guaranteed by the public, for the old obligations upon the peasantry.¹⁹

The compulsory service obligations, which many tenants in Denmark and Southern Sweden owed their landlords, gradually disappeared, being generally committed into cash payments. In 1788 such services were performed on about 280,000 acres in Denmark, in 1807 on 112,000 acres, in 1861 on 15,400 acres, and in 1881 on only 4,200 acres.²⁰ The commutation of tithes into cash payments presented many difficulties, since they constituted a considerable part of the clergy's income, but by 1848 only about nine per cent. was still paid in kind in Denmark and legislation finally decreed that such payments should cease after January 1, 1863. In Sweden this was accomplished six years later.²¹ In 1845 the Norwegian fisheries tithe was abolished so far as clergy and government were concerned, and public bonds were issued to redeem it where private individuals had purchased the right to collect it. How difficult it might be for the peasants to get their payments commuted from kind to cash may be gauged by the attitude of such a liberal economist as Schweigaard in 1848. The question then being debated in the *storting* was the manner in which tenants and purchasers of ecclesiastical lands were to pay rents and interest. Schweigaard favored continuation of payment in kind on the ground that recipients would suffer if a rational exploitation of the world's gold and silver supply should reduce the purchasing power of money; the grain-rent, he held, was an old, well-proven institution, and grain values had shown little tendency to fluctuate. Ueland and the peasantry favored payment in money as one further step in the laudable process whereby the land was being freed of its encumbrances. The resulting law was a compromise based on the minority report, prescribing minute safeguards for the commutation to cash payments.²²

To the peasantry it was a matter of the utmost importance to secure simplification of their taxes and, most especially, the

equal taxation of all land. These problems did not, however, assume equal importance in each country. Norway, where feudalism never successfully established itself and where payment of taxes in money was developed relatively early, could most easily simplify taxes. By the decree of April 15, 1818, rural taxes were consolidated in Denmark and their payment converted from kind to silver; thereafter the unequal taxation of the land constituted the greatest difficulty. So-called "privileged land" paid approximately twenty five per cent. less in taxes than the "unprivileged."²³ Sweden was backward with respect to both simplification and equalization.

As soon as the peasantry became politically articulate, about 1830-1840, these problems became, with others, the basis of a class policy. Why should the peasantry be singled out for special taxation, and not those who used the luxuries of the towns? Or why should the land owned by one group of citizens be favored at the expense of the rest? In Norway, where the liberal constitution of 1814 afforded broad political rights to the peasants, the land tax question reached its earliest and most radical solution. Almost every *storting* between 1818 and 1836 reduced the discrimination somewhat, and in 1837, after a sharp contest, almost entirely on the principle involved, the land tax was totally abolished.²⁴

In Denmark, the great reforms had by no means given the peasantry full rank with other social classes. The reforms had, however, imbued them with a spirit of possession which made them increasingly sensitive to every form of inequality. The establishment of the system of regional diets, or Estates, 1831-35, therefore, was quickly followed by the rise of a class-conscious political movement demanding, among other things,²⁵ the equal taxation of all land.²⁶ In 1850, after the substitution of the National Liberal parliamentary system for absolutism (1848) a victory for bourgeois egalitarianism, and after the peasant army of Denmark had heroically defended the country against the Prussians in the Schleswig-Holstein war, a law was adopted abolishing tax-privileges²⁷ but providing for compensation to certain classes of "privileged" lands.

The simplification of the many Swedish taxes in kind was agitated for nearly a century before it was finally achieved by the *riksdag* of 1853-54. During the French Revolution the eco-

nomic privileges of the Swedish nobility were sharply challenged by a small but vigorous group of pamphleteers,²⁸ and when the new constitution of 1809 was being drawn up the peasants stood firm on the equal taxation of all land. The nobility held that the traditional tax exemptions had become a species of property through being figured into the price of land and could be removed only when properly compensated; the principle of the equal obligation of all citizens to pay taxes they did not deny. All that the peasants accomplished at that time was an act (1810) enabling commoners to buy and own "privileged" land.²⁹ Thereafter no solution of this problem was seriously attempted until after the parliamentary reform of 1865. The Swedish peasants, refusing to consider compensation to the owners of "privileged" land, after the reform founded their own party. Eventually, in 1892, they adopted the details of a compromise which they had in principle agreed to in 1873, and the gradual abolition of land taxes could begin.

III. THE NEW RURAL SOCIAL SYSTEM

It will be quite obvious that changes as fundamental as those here described would produce corresponding alterations in the rural social pattern. When special rights were removed and individual enterprise substituted for the collective enterprise of the village, the drift between social classes must necessarily become greatly accelerated. The capable could ascend more readily in the social scale, but an effective barrier against descent into abject misery, namely the solidarity of the village group, had been removed. Thus the range of social differentiation was increased.

On the whole, the great proprietorial landlord class diminished. This was not so much true in Sweden as in Norway, and especially in Denmark, but there was everywhere a tendency after 1800 for tenants to purchase their holdings, and for larger, even moderately sized, enterprises to be subdivided. Only thus, Schweigaard noted, was it possible for the rural population to increase, except by producing a land-less proletariat.³⁰ He found that between 1802 and 1838, in Norway, the number of agricultural enterprises had, by breaking up of the estates, increased from 79,256 to 109,500.³¹ The pressure of a growing population upon the land and mercantilistic economic policies

produced much the same results in Sweden, even though that country had much more arable waste land in reserve. In the provinces where the money economy first appeared and fluid possessions began to take their place alongside land as a measure of wealth, the strength of the traditional family tie to the land was somewhat reduced and alienation or parcellization of the family farm rendered much less painful.³² But more than anything else it was the faith in the benefits of a numerous population which induced the governments to remove the main legal restrictions upon parcellization. Particularly important were the Swedish laws of 1747 and 1751, and the Dano-Norwegian of 1769.³³ The results were soon apparent in considerably accelerated subdivision. By the opening of the nineteenth century farms had in several parts of Sweden and Norway been so far reduced in size that a very serious social problem resulted, for a considerable section of the rural population in several regions was rapidly being reduced to abject poverty. When this situation attained the proportions of a crisis, in the eighteen thirties and 'forties, the Swedes were driven to a critical review of their land policies. A strong reaction, typified by Bishop Agardh, appeared against small enterprises. He desired the traditional, patriarchal system restored by legislation, the system of moderately sized farms capable of maintaining their owners in dignified independence.³⁴ Opposed to this view were most of the liberals, who championed an unrestricted land policy collaterally with occupational and commercial freedom as the only means of avoiding the social evil of a landless rural proletariat. In 1827 the conservative view prevailed in legislation, but it became increasingly evident that the old system could not be artificially upheld. All pretense of doing so was abandoned in 1881. Actually, however, certain provinces, particularly Mälaren and Östergötland, owing to local conditions, exhibited a stronger tendency toward consolidation into larger holdings than toward subdivision, with the result that in Sweden the two movements somewhat offset one another.³⁵

Many Danish estates were parcelled between 1788 and 1815. Proprietors frequently lost heavily when inflation enabled their peasant debtors to pay in depreciated currency. Those who retained their estates could not refrain from plunging into debt when credit was plentiful; and when depression and inflation

overtook them, between 1818 and 1828, they were unable to reduce operation costs and living standards in proportion to their depleted incomes. Consequently they often suffered foreclosures. This did not necessarily mean that such estates were resold in parcels, however, for when grain prices and profits were low, peasants would not purchase land. Furthermore, the smaller enterprises adopted so tardily the technical reforms urged by the *Landhusholdningsselskab* (Society for the Promotion of Agriculture) that influential leaders of opinion turned from small owners in favor of the more progressive larger estates. But when economic conditions again justified investments by small land holders for improvements, public sympathy reverted to the system of small holdings. In 1833 only ten per cent. of the soil of Denmark was cultivated in large enterprises. When a peasant party appeared at the Roskilde Estates in 1844, a large number of petitions requested legislation to transform tenancy into full ownership. After the adoption of the liberal constitution in 1849, such legislation was possible, and an important law was adopted in 1854. It failed to comply with the demand of the Peasant Party that landlords should be obliged to sell their lands to their hereditary tenants, but it created inducements for such sales. The parcellization movement reached large proportions in the 1850's, but slowed down somewhat in the next decade.³⁰

The rural social class which derived the most benefit from this breaking up of the villages and the estates was the yeomanry, that is, the class who owned their own moderately sized family farms, for in all three countries crown lands were sold to tenants in an effort to promote the interests of these proprietors as the socially most valuable class. In Norway fundamental economic conditions had turned the tide in their favor well before the opening of the nineteenth century. In Sweden they were far more numerous than any other rural social group in 1800, and held approximately the same position in 1870.³⁷ Considerable and genuine as was the progress made by the small owners in Denmark between 1788 and 1818, the census of 1833 showed that only about half of the soil was in their hands. As a matter of fact, the depression of 1818-1828 was survived far more easily by the tenant class who had made few investments, than by the small owners.

Had landlords been in position to take advantage of the situation, large estates would then have increased, for many small owners, groaning under heavy debts, sought to sell. Fortunately, even the great proprietors did not want lands. The small owners were therefore compelled to survive, as they could more easily than the large owners by being better able to reduce their standard of living. When economic conditions improved again the institution of tenantry was attacked by the small owners, the tenants themselves, and even by many of the liberal bourgeoisie.³⁸ Thereafter the transition from tenantry to ownership was resumed, and by 1865 Denmark was preponderantly a country of small peasant proprietors.⁴⁰ Such proprietorship did not always mean prosperity, however. On the contrary the era of extensive grain farming, which lasted approximately from 1800 to 1870, afforded little comfort to the owners of small plots.⁴⁰

As far as the agricultural laborers were concerned, some gained and others lost by the individualization of the land. Generally speaking, the servants gained, for they lived with their employers and partly shared their rising standard of living. As prices and profits increased and as opportunities opened up for other forms of employment, they were even able to increase their real wages.⁴¹ With the so-called *husmænd*, *torpare*, and *statare*, crofters with families to support, it was different. When the village was broken up, they lost their grazing rights upon the common, and in the process of strip consolidation their claims were usually overlooked. Consequently they often found themselves members of a poverty-stricken proletariat, with very poor land or none at all, practically bound to one spot by reason of having families, and unable to share appreciably in the general rise of the rural living standard. This was especially true in Denmark.⁴² In each country, however, the owners of farms frequently took advantage of the liberalized land laws to force their laborers into very small establishments. This was by no means a new practice. It had long been, and continued far into the nineteenth century to be, more profitable to give the laborer a cottage to anchor him and a small piece of land with which he might partly support his family, than to pay money wages. Now laborers were permitted in considerable numbers to settle down in such cottages, usually

on the edge of the cultivated area where they could increase the size of the farm by pushing the boundary of cultivation back into the forest, the marsh and the heath, or up the mountain slope. The capital increase resulting from their labors benefited the owner. But not infrequently these plots developed into new farms which the proprietor might sell to the crofter himself for the cash with which to make improvements on the main farm, or upon which he might establish a second son. In all three countries the lower rural classes multiplied rapidly, though their economic condition failed to improve perceptibly. By 1840 the situation was truly alarming.⁴³

IV. BETTER AGRICULTURAL TECHNIQUES

There could be no considerable improvement of agricultural technique until the land had been individualized and the strips consolidated. Not until then was the individual farmer free to adopt new methods. This transformation came earliest and most completely in Denmark; it was well under way in Sweden in 1840, and in Norway after 1850. It must be remembered, however, that in Sweden and Norway the communal system had never established itself as completely as in Denmark.

When the communal system had been undermined the adoption of better methods was determined largely by the alternations of business cycles and by general economic conditions, especially as they affected the trade in grain and animal products.

For Danish agriculture, so heavily dependent upon export, the situation after 1814 was materially altered. Norway was no longer a controllable market; Danish grain, therefore, would henceforth have to accommodate itself to world conditions. The government consequently in 1820 abolished the export duties, and itself entered the grain trade by accepting grain for taxes and even by purchasing for resale. The fact was that, as long as Norway could be expected to take the Danish farmers' surplus, they paid no attention to quality or cleaning. Their grain therefore had a very bad reputation in England and elsewhere.⁴⁴ By entering the trade itself the government could compel the farmers to deliver a better product and thus support the efforts of private traders and the *Landhus-*

holdningsselskab.⁴⁵ The state ceased this activity in 1828. But even the dirty grain found a market, for it was shipped to Hamburg to be cleaned with good machinery and re-exported. In the 1840's, however, England became a steady buyer, and under the high requirements of that market Danish grain was soon brought up to good quality.

Between 1800 and 1830 Swedish agriculture improved so much and internal distribution of local surpluses attained such a degree of efficiency, that grain imports gave place to exports.⁴⁶ For the farmers of Denmark and Sweden, therefore, the increasing tendency in food-importing countries, particularly Great Britain, toward the reduction or complete abolition of duties on foodstuffs was very important. The year 1845, when crops were poor in western Europe and the potato disease brought disaster to Ireland, proved profitable for Scandinavian agriculture by causing already ascendant prices to soar. And in the 'fifties agriculture profited from the boom as well as industry and commerce. Though not a great exporter of agricultural products, the Norwegian farmer, too, benefited indirectly from the better prices.⁴⁷

The possibility of profit and the disappearance of the communal system were prerequisites of better techniques, but educational agencies were necessary to acquaint the common farmer with improved methods; and one of the most important of these vehicles of information were the agricultural societies. Several such societies had been founded in the eighteenth century, but the wars and political disturbances from 1790 to 1815 resulted in their pronounced deflation where they were not completely dissolved.⁴⁸ The economic crisis after the wars destroyed most of the remainder; the local societies practically disappeared, a few of the regional associations barely survived, and the Danish *Landhusholdningsselskab* alone maintained an active existence. In Sweden, Bernadotte, then Crown Prince Charles John, helped to found the *Lantbruksakademien* (Academy of Agriculture) in 1813, a semi-private, semi-public institution, which until 1890 was entrusted by government with most of the administration relating to agriculture. Although all societal activity practically disappeared in Norway between 1815 and 1829, in the later year the Association for the Welfare of Norway was revived for

the sole purpose of promoting agriculture. After the economic crisis had passed, local societies began to appear again. Capable now of much closer coordination with one another than in the eighteenth century, they gradually developed an activity which made the earlier societies appear feeble. In none of the three countries did the government set up any special administration for agriculture prior to 1865. They appropriated but small sums for its promotion and often delegated their disbursements to the societies.⁴⁰

The first agronomist in Sweden and apparently the first in Scandinavia was an Englishman by the name of Stephens, engaged by the Nerike Economic Society in 1806. He trained a number of young men who received appointments elsewhere. By 1835 the movement had grown to such proportions that the government took Stephens into its own service, and, when two years later he died in a shipwreck, appointed one of his pupils. In 1862 there were eleven agronomists in the Swedish public service, besides those who were employed by societies. Norway got no public agronomists until 1855, when two Swedes and a Norwegian were appointed. One of the Swedes, Johan Lindequist, became a pioneer in the Norwegian agricultural revolution. In Sweden and Norway the agronomists were used chiefly to prepare projects for the improvement of waste land; in Denmark, however, their task consisted largely in the improvement of land already under cultivation.⁵⁰ The Danish veterinary science dates from 1773, when the institute in Copenhagen was established; the Swedish from 1784, though the national institute was not founded until 1819; Norway never established her own veterinary school, but arranged to train her veterinarians in Denmark.

Of great importance in the development of better methods were the agricultural schools which each country established. The first were patterned after Thaer's institution at Möglin, near Berlin (founded 1805), where a number of students were given an opportunity to do practical work on a model farm and were given a brief course in theory and accounting.⁵¹ Since these earliest institutions were able to take only a few students, they were patronized mainly by the sons of proprietors. Most of them enjoyed partial state support. Toward the close of the period both Norway and Sweden had provincial

agricultural academics and higher ones. Various specialized institutions in Denmark were consolidated in 1856 to form the Agricultural High School near Copenhagen.⁵²

In all three countries the 'forties and 'fifties presented exciting possibilities for improvements and profits. Associations and local societies conducted cattle shows and exhibitions of tools, machinery, and products. At meetings and conventions the most prominent citizens and officials were present to read dissertations and to render account of experiments. The press was filled with articles on cattle and crops, buildings and implements. "Even poets and scientists," wrote the political historian Ernst Sars with ill concealed disgust, "who by their previous studies and work would naturally have been supposed to be above this fashion of the day, were carried away by it and sought as far as ability and opportunity permitted to participate in the general food scramble."⁵³ It was a veritable revival of the "agromania."

Very slowly, however, were the common peasants won to these new methods. Except on some proprietorial estates the old technique persisted until long after 1815. Although some few farmers in Denmark had been persuaded to adopt root crops and a system of rational rotation, yet long after the abandonment of the open field system most of them clung to the practice of letting one field lie fallow. "The ancient methods of agriculture in the main continue unchanged, and the implements as well . . ." wrote the governor of Upsala province, B. W. Fock, in 1822.⁵⁴ As late as 1850, the summary of the quinquennial reports of the Norwegian provincial governors contained the following statement:

A rational system of rotation . . . has certainly as yet been but sporadically adopted. Nevertheless, it appears that this reform, which generally has many obstacles to overcome, is in many places being prepared.⁵⁵

Some progress, however, could always be reported,⁵⁶ even though to well-informed and impatient men it seemed slow. The extremely difficult years between 1815 and 1830 offered the farmer little temptation to adopt an unfamiliar technique. Scrupulous frugality alone enabled him to survive that economic holocaust, and he could easily observe that those who

had most rashly borrowed to improve their technique or increase their standards of living were most severely pressed. One reason why the farmer survived the crisis better in Sweden than in Denmark was that, since the land passed more slowly to complete private ownership, he was not so heavily encumbered with debt.⁵⁷ When the crisis was over, peasants did not soon forget the lesson. Only the prospect of certain profits could bring that generation to adopt innovations. Fortunately, land values were so deflated during the depression, especially in Denmark, that many farmers could calculate production costs from a low basis.⁵⁸

Since the period from 1815 to 1865 was in Scandinavia, as elsewhere in Europe, marked by extensive grain farming, it was natural that the significant developments in agricultural technique should be made chiefly with a view to increasing the crop yield. From 1830 the price of grain was rising, as is shown in the following table from Swedish statistics (in *kroner*).⁵⁹

Average Annual	1 Hectoliter (2.84) bushels)				1 kg.	
	wheat	rye	barley	oats	peas	butter
1836-40	10.63	7.93	6.19	3.59	8.55	0.91
1841-45	11.07	8.60	5.65	2.99	8.53	0.92
1846-50	10.80	8.06	6.30	3.48	8.62	0.98
1851-55	13.77	10.11	7.69	4.49	10.21	1.10
1856-60	14.16	9.33	8.10	4.90	11.45	1.39
1861-65	12.23	9.09	7.26	4.13	10.35	1.27

The price of land increased in proportion more rapidly, and trade in land became fairly brisk.⁶⁰ In a period of rising land values it was natural that such projects as drainage, later tiling, should become popular. German farmers, experts in drainage technique, emigrated in considerable numbers, especially to Denmark and Sweden, and though Mügge's⁶¹ patriotism caused him to err in ascribing all the progress of Swedish agriculture to them, they were undeniably a factor. The manager of the royal estate at Fredriksborg (Denmark) had lived in England where he had become acquainted with Sir Joseph Banks and other gentlemen farmers, and in the 1820's he was

applying Pilkington's system of drainage.⁶² Gradually root-crops and crop rotation displaced the two and three-field systems with their waste of land in fallow. The transition was practically completed for Denmark in the 'fifties; for Sweden and Norway in the next decade. Nowhere was there any adequate attention to fertilizing in this period; natural fertilizers were poor because stock was niggardly fed, and commercial fertilizers were almost unknown. But the English practice of enriching the soil with marl was introduced into Denmark, and before 1865 marl pits were opened in practically every community.

The emphasis upon grain farming, the good market after 1830, and most especially the relentless increase in population, all quickened the age-old struggle to extend the cultivated area. Even in Denmark, where settlement was most dense, there was some inferior, usually marshy, land which a better market made it profitable to improve for cultivation. In Norway, and especially in Sweden, there were vast areas that could be exploited, even though, as Malthus observed in 1799, there were "many spots of land in tillage, which never would have been touched with a plow here" (England).⁶³ The movement had gained some momentum in the eighteenth century, but it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth that it became a rushing flood. Tegnér, the Swedish poet, urged that the loss of Finland be compensated for by the development of Sweden. There was an obvious retardation during the difficult post-war years, but between 1820 and 1860 the cultivated area in Sweden more than doubled. Industry and trade were not, in this period, able to absorb any considerable part of the population increase, and the Swedish peasant had not yet discovered America. Sweden itself was then his America, and into its marshy or upland southern soil, into its deep northern forests, he pushed his pioneering activities. Hans Järta's account from the province of Stora Kopparberg (1822) is descriptive of the earlier stage:

Extensions of the cultivated area are undertaken every year in this province, not as large enterprises which suddenly disrupt the previous relations between production and consumption, or between the demand for and the supply of labor and capital, but as small expansions of an old and thus constantly growing agriculture.⁶⁴

Later the provincial governors reported an almost feverish activity. Statistics on the cultivated area in Sweden (hectares) at various dates afford the best picture of the intensity of this movement.⁶⁵

1750	600,000	1830	1,400,000
1800	850,000	1840	1,650,000
1810	925,000	1850	2,025,000
1820	1,100,000	1860	2,500,000

The Norwegian phase of this *landnam*, or land-taking, did not approximate the Swedish in vigor but was sufficiently marked to contrast strikingly with the older comparative stability. Thus, for example, 11,723 *tönder* were broken in 1829-35, 28,000 *tdr.* in 1846-50, and 34,064 *tdr.* in 1856-60.⁶⁶ It was an epic achievement, well summarized by the Swedish statistician Gustav Sundbärg:

Settlements were opened up, farms consolidated and partitioned, tenant farms were set apart or given up, crofts were established, and laborers' cottages were built at the estates,—this was the sum of Swedish economic life at this time. Agriculture was the lot of youth, and this lot was embraced with energetic enthusiasm.⁶⁷

It was of grave social import, however, that the new land for the most part did not get into the hands of new owners, but rather constituted profitable additions to the plough-lands of the old land-owning class. The result was therefore a rapid increase in the rural proletariat.⁶⁸

The new capitalistic spirit in agriculture demanded not only superficially expanded areas for exploitation and more rational methods, but better tools and machinery. The eighteenth-century "agromaniacs" had been intensely interested in this latter problem; they had made some headway with the proprietors, but the main body of the rural population had ignored them. The individualization of the land, however, the prospect of larger profits, and not least the demonstration farming of the agricultural academies,—all of which were experimenters with, and even producers of, better implements,—combined after 1830 to arouse also the common farmers. Where before sharp class antipathies had been partly responsible for the peasants' failure to adopt the suggestions of the proprietors, the agronomists, most of whom were peasants' sons, now proved themselves able to instruct the proprietors.⁶⁹ The press carried descriptions and drawings

of improved tools and household utensils.⁷⁰ Foreign models of plows, drills, discs, harrows, spades, and threshing machines were imported, adapted by experiment to local conditions, and industrial establishments founded to manufacture them. Thus the first American (Freeborn) plows were brought to Denmark in 1828 by the manufacturer, Drewsen; they immediately proved to be superior to the English and Scotch types by reason of their lighter weight; and when in 1836 a shop was opened in Funen to manufacture them it was possible, between 1843 and 1846, to sell 12,000.⁷¹ The plow produced by the Swedish agricultural academy at Ultuna was awarded the first silver medal at the Paris Exposition of 1885, and became very popular. In the 'forties and 'fifties the modern plow was widely adapted in the more fertile parts of the Scandinavian countries. Jutland and the mountain regions of Sweden and Norway followed more slowly. Other implements were taken up also. Waterpowered and, toward the close of the period, steam powered threshing machinery made its appearance. The improved Swedish harrow was widely adopted in Denmark and Norway. But in the most advanced Norwegian province, Akershus, hand tools were still home-made and very poor in the 1850's; the iron-bladed spade was infrequent there until the construction crews on the first railway began to use them in 1855. This was owing to no obscurantist dislike of new ideas, for even the Scotch apologist for the machine age, Samuel Laing, doubted that it would be wise for Denmark to adopt agricultural machinery.⁷² Not until after 1865 was Scandinavian agriculture partially mechanized, but the break with the old tradition and the old implements was well advanced before that date.

Scandinavian agriculture during the period of extensive grain cultivation has usually been criticized as mere exploitation (*roudrift*). The soil was milked for what there was in it, as in the American West, and little attention was paid to safeguarding its future fertility. But extension necessarily preceded intensification, since man naturally follows the line of least resistance. The historian of Danish agriculture, C. C. Larsen, therefore seems to have correctly interpreted the era, not only for his own country but for all Scandinavia, when he wrote:

Capital for operating expenditures and for improvement of the soil was lacking and access to cheap loans was not as easy as now; furthermore there was a deep-seated dread of mortgages, which in this period amounted to only 33 per cent. of the value of the land. Nor could the soil justify a large production of manure as long as the necessary basic improvements had not been made upon it. Therefore [by the system of reckless exploitation] a portion of the basic capital (*Jordkapitalen*) was set free, prices rose, and the yield increased, whereas wages were raised but slowly;... The price of land was low in proportion to agricultural profits... and indebtedness was not markedly increased, since there was but little exchange of property. All this explains why agriculture on the whole was a profitable business during the period of exploitation.⁷³

Toward the end of the period, however, it became increasingly evident that the system had reached the limit of its possibilities, and after 1865 the emphasis was placed more and more upon intensification.

How successful the Scandinavian farmer was in increasing his production, both absolutely and relatively, may be judged by a few statistics. Sweden, which until 1829 had never had an excess of grain exports over imports, began exporting surplusses in that year and in spite of a rapid increase of population continued to do so until the 1890's. In 1834, the Swedish grain production was 8,793,943 *tunnor*; in 1860 it was 13,476,483 *tunnor*.⁷⁴ The increase in yield per unit of seed is shown in the following table.⁷⁵

Quantities sown, in <i>tunnor</i> .							
Year	Wheat	Rye	Corn	Oats	Mixed Grain	Peas Beans	Potatoes
1802	19,244	277,864	317,246	288,714	113,395	31,778	53,631
1865	76,337	565,494	466,305	1,247,555	171,426	80,253	1,369,249
1869	77,638	567,253	462,334	1,352,039	170,198	72,267	1,361,038
Quantities harvested, in <i>tunnor</i> .							
1802	105,515	1,172,811	1,582,188	1,317,908	561,242	166,042	400,555
1865	445,975	3,075,266	2,136,370	4,286,806	709,963	260,596	7,065,396
1869	503,843	3,156,131	2,352,491	6,163,529	845,574	279,250	6,313,392
1 tunna — 4.5 bushels							

Norway has never been able to produce all of her own food, but within the single decade, 1835-1845, her yields increased as follows:⁷⁶

	1835	1845
Wheat	8,547 Tdr.	12,237 Tdr.
Rye	67,049	91,708
Barley	407,504	585,599
Meslin	269,015	373,427
Oats	1,017,175	1,357,990
Peas	26,793	40,801
Potatoes	2,024,941	3,060,681

The production of both grain and potatoes more than doubled in Norway from 1835 to 1865;⁷⁷ and the percentage of the total area sown which was planted with potatoes increased from 27.2 per cent. in 1835 to 36.2 per cent. in 1865.

The "potato preachers" and others who assisted in the introduction of that vegetable into the Scandinavian countries performed a service no less notable than the much honored agricultural contributions of the medieval monastic orders. The potato was known in all three countries before 1800, and the Swedish famine in 1783-1784 helped to overcome the aversion of the masses. Nevertheless it was in the first two decades of the nineteenth century that potato cultivation became widespread. It then rapidly became one of the most important agricultural products, as is shown in the tables above. By 1846, there was danger that the potato would displace other crops as it had in Ireland; but in that year the dry-rot appeared. In spite of the alarm and the real distress which this event caused, the governor of Jönköping province, Sweden, concluded that it would probably check a development that threatened to become excessive.⁷⁸

The technique of animal husbandry and of dairying underwent almost no changes until after 1830. The recurring cattle epidemics of the eighteenth century impelled Denmark and Sweden to send students to the French veterinarian Bourgelat, and served as an argument for the individualization of the land to enable the peasant to isolate the cattle. There was a considerable theoretical interest in husbandry prior to 1800, but marketing facilities for the more perishable dairy and meat products were even worse than for grain.

Even after 1830, improvements were comparatively few

and slow. But such as they were, they were basic to the notable achievements after 1865. The first prerequisite was more generous foddering. Gradually, and against the stubborn opposition of milk-maids whose pride it was to bring many cattle through the winter on little fodder, the realization gained ground that grain-fed and well-fed animals were more productive. Barns were somewhat improved and some notion of cleanliness penetrated even to the common farmers. Immigrant Germans introduced the better methods into Denmark, the Swedes learned from immigrant Germans and Danes, and the Association for the Welfare of Norway brought fifty Swiss cattle masters to the country between 1851 and 1857. Some attention was directed by both public and private agencies to the problem of better breeding, especially by the introduction of English cattle. At the close of the period Denmark was considerably in advance of Sweden, and Sweden was ahead of Norway in animal husbandry. In this respect, Norway was probably the most backward country in western Europe.⁷⁰ Practically the only export of meat from the Scandinavian countries was that of barn-fed steers, which went from Jutland via Schleswig or, after 1860, direct to England.

Dairying practices were extremely primitive in 1830. Milk was allowed to set cream in wooden containers; and there were few sanitary precautions. In the 1830's, however, Danish and Swedish proprietors began to engage dairy maids from Holstein, who practised two important principles,—scrupulous cleanliness and elementary refrigeration. By 1865 Danish and Swedish butter from such estates had found markets in Holland and England.⁸⁰

The raising of sheep for wool continued to attract much public and private attention in the first half of the nineteenth century as well as in the eighteenth century. But about 1860 Australian wool began to take profit out of the domestic wool, and in 1863 Swedish economists were urging that the emphasis be rather placed on mutton.⁸¹ Thereafter sheep-raising steadily declined in all three countries. Horse-breeding with a view to producing a better draft animal, suited to local conditions was begun; Denmark raised not a few horses for export. Swine did not come in for much attention until the revolution in dairying after 1865.

In addition to their farming the Scandinavian peasantry had from time immemorial engaged in many auxiliary occupations. The Danish economist, Nathanson, wrote in 1830, "what the farmer needs by way of clothing he produces almost entirely himself." And further:

What sort of situation would we have in this country, if we should be forced to import all these wares from abroad? . . . Truly! These home crafts are in the economic sense one of Denmark's most important means of support. It is only deplorable that they are not practiced even more widely, and that the men in the country districts are not more occupied therewith, for in this matter they rank far behind the women.⁸²

They spun their own linen and woolen yarns, they wove their own cloth. Among them were not a few craftsmen, especially tailors, shoemakers and carpenters. Until factory-made implements were demonstrated to be superior, and what was more important, cheaper, they made their own tools. But by 1865, these household occupations were rapidly breaking down. In the mines and forests of Sweden and Norway, however, the crafts and industrial work occupied the rural population almost as much as the land. Charcoal burning afforded an important source of income; the small and widely scattered iron-foundries provided winter employment to many farmers. The timber industry was also a winter employment. In several Swedish provinces, as in Bavaria, there was a high degree of specialization between district and district; this was especially true of Dalarne. Along the main thoroughfares, hauling, until the beginning of the railway age, constituted a source of income and of aggravation,—more of the latter than the former, except in the region about and north of Oslo, where the peasants neglected even good land to transport timber.⁸³ Gardens and orchards were found almost solely on the estates and near the larger cities until about 1830. Progressive proprietors and reforming officials and pastors had been more zealous than successful in promoting them. In isolated districts, such as the island of Funen, in Denmark, and Sogn, in Norway, orchards were common, but kitchen gardens increased in number and in the variety of their products almost only after 1830. In 1865 gardening and horticulture were still in their infancy.

Between 1784, when the great reforms were begun in Denmark, and 1865, Scandinavian agriculture was transformed from the communalistic to the capitalistic system. There had been tendencies in this direction before 1784 and the process was not entirely finished in 1865. But the rural social pattern had been basically altered. That the new order provided a greater measure of employment and opportunity for a larger number can not be doubted; but the succeeding decades of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries brought to agriculture little of the permanence and stability that had marked the communal system. New problems presented themselves with capitalism, problems which have not even yet been solved.

CHAPTER IX

THE RELIGION OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES

O WORLD, thou choosest not the better part:
It is not wisdom to be only wise,
And on the inward vision close the eyes,
But it is wisdom to believe the heart.
Columbus found the world, and had no chart,
Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
To trust the soul's invincible surmise
Was all his science and his only art.
Our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine
That lights the pathway but one step ahead
Across a void of mystery and dread.
Bid, then, the tender light of faith to shine
By which alone the mortal man is lead
Unto the thinking of the thought divine.

George Santayana

The Age of Reason was succeeded about 1800 by a period usually described as reaction toward the older ideals of faith. Whether, viewed historically, it really represented a turning back is very doubtful, at least for the great mass of people. Those masses had never been brought to a rational philosophy; indeed it may plausibly be asserted that when in this period they became articulate they merely expressed the cultural level to which they had attained. The fact that their ideals at this level were mainly those of faith proves no reversion, but only that they were beginning to enter the community of the intellect. Among the already cultured classes, there clearly did occur a considerable retrogression. But much of it was more apparent than real, more a matter of outward expression than a fundamental shift of conviction. For rationalism was itself so much a mere mode of expression, it contained so large an element of mere faith, that it may well be doubted whether much genuine rationality was lost when

the outward form gave way. In any event the so-called Age of Romanticism exhibits quite as many representatives of true reason as the preceding age. It is a popular fallacy that the Age of Reason terminated abruptly. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The men who inaugurated romanticism had grown up in the rationalist era and even to the younger generation whom they trained they transmitted some of its influence.

Although the transition from rationalism to romanticism was gradual, romanticism still differs in basic pattern from rationalism. Cosmopolitanism retreats before an advancing nationalism; the logical gives way to the sentimental; the passion for utility is transformed into worship of the aesthetic; the mechanical conception of the universe fades into a more or less mystical metaphysics; belief in the perfectibility of man and his predestination to happiness in this world cedes ground to a fatalistic acceptance of things as they are.

I. ELEMENTS OF MYSTICISM IN THE AGE OF REASON

It has already been shown that the first symptoms of romanticism appeared long before the close of the eighteenth century.¹ In truth, the new viewpoint thrived upon predisposing factors in Scandinavian life. Rationalism has been scorned by some Scandinavian historians because it did not leave a more enduring residue; the wonder is rather that it left as much. In the field of religion, as has been noted, its form was very moderate. Worst of all, its leading representatives failed to maintain direct contact with the natural sciences. Hence they became mere deductive reasoners instead of empiricists. Conversely, the true scientists often failed to draw the full philosophical conclusions from their own work. Linné, for example, was content to remain a very moderate Wolffian in religion and philosophy. His doctrine of the Nemesis was quite as mystical as anything conceived by his fellow scientist Swedenborg.² The sciences themselves declined somewhat during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Tessin's acute comment on Klingensjtjerna might be applied to many scientists:

Klingensjtjerna dealt seriously with the Heavens and very cavalierly with God. When he became tutor to the Prince Royal, he degenerated

more and more into a courtier and neglected his studies, confining himself to theory and abstaining from the practice which is so indispensable in the sciences he professed.³

It was a natural result, therefore, that rationalism progressively lost its most secure foundation, and when it became divorced from the scientific method, it very properly ceased to enjoy higher sanction than other speculative philosophies.

In spite of constant efforts, rationalism failed utterly to eradicate superstition. That the working and rural population remained comparatively untouched is not strange. But in actual fact many of the very lights of the age continued to cherish and to adopt highly irrational ideas. Animal magnetism and mesmerism enjoyed a great vogue; spiritualistic seances, somnambulism, the study of dreams, and alchemy had many adherents. To thoroughgoing rationalists occultism was an abomination; in Sweden the poet Kellgren attacked it with vicious humor. But these cults continued to flourish. In Denmark from 1779 to 1784 Prince Karl of Hesse kept at his estate a French adventurer, Joseph Marie St. Germain, with whom he conducted various mysterious experiments. Ultimately he succeeded in attaching to his inner circle the Bernstorffs, Cai Reventlow, and even the Crown Prince Frederick himself. To the latter he contrived to marry his daughter. The royal luminary of the enlightenment, Gustav III, found it not incompatible with his philosophy to participate in some of these occult rites. His brother, later Charles XIII, is known to have searched for hidden treasure with the aid of magic.⁴

Crass as were these superstitions among the elite, they were on but a slightly lower plane than freemasonry. This movement came to Scandinavia from England and Germany in the 1840's, but it was only in the last quarter of the century that it achieved its strangely dominating position. Then, however, the kings themselves became Grand Masters. Although in certain spheres, especially education, the Masonic Order made noteworthy practical contributions, it became the wet-nurse of all the confused mysticism which the enlightenment professed to discard, varying in degree from the magical practices of its Danish Grand Master, Prince Karl of Hesse, to the "natural religion" of deism. Within its fold almost every conceivable kind of "prophet" and trickster found asylum, practicing their

trade under the guise of Eastern wisdom.⁵ The masonic ritual served this practical age as a constant avenue of escape from arduous intellectual exercise into restful mysticism. Even such a vigorous spirit as Treschow fell under its spell:

For, while the philosophy I professed preserved me from wild imagining, the mystical veil of the Order made me always aware that both in religion and in nature there is many a truth which is hidden by a similar veil that no one has yet been able wholly to remove.⁶

A number of literary societies were formed in Sweden modelled upon the Masonic Order, and it was characteristic of all that they imitated its secretive air of mystery.

The mercantile bourgeoisie of Sweden were especially attracted to the religious occultism of Emanuel Swedenborg. Though a scientist of distinction,⁷ Swedenborg became progressively more engrossed with the problem of the spiritual. His own theories were sufficiently mystical to arouse the disgust of Tessin, who visited him out of curiosity, and who commented that "I do not know whether I should call happy or unhappy a weak-minded person who finds pleasure in his own hallucinations,"⁸ but they were moderate compared to those developed by his successors under the influence of pietism, masonry and mesmerism. Swedenborg's own psychical and religious researches laid the foundation for theosophy, but its edifice was constructed later. Needless to say, this form of mysticism did not reach the masses, but many of the middle classes and the bureaucracy found it a satisfactory philosophy.⁹

In spite of rationalist efforts to develop a "natural religion," the theology of the Scandinavian churches remained fundamentally orthodox. Official preference might be shown to pastors of the liberal viewpoint, men like Gustav III and Struensée might abuse the churches, the missionary spirit might practically disappear, —it would require more than this to dislodge orthodox Lutheranism. The rural clergy and their parishioners remained almost impervious to deism as a theology, even though they frequently espoused the utilitarian spirit of the Age of Reason. In general, they clung to the older religious formulas less from any thoughtful conviction, than from sheer inertia. Nevertheless, those older forms remained more vital than newer ones and proved the frame-

work of the religious revival of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Scandinavian thought and art, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, exhibited the same tendencies toward appreciation of nature, democracy, and nationalism, as appeared in other European countries. Although perhaps more properly the first symptoms of romanticism than its predisposing factors, in any event they prepared the way.¹⁰ A departure from the rationalistic enlightenment, they made an ever-widening breach. The new trend depended more and more upon emotion, upon feeling, upon folk-intuition—that is, upon mysticism—to justify its position. But not until 1800 was there any fully conscious intellectual revolt.

II. THE POPULAR RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

In the peasant's mind, the church stands upon a high place, and by itself, dedicated to peace, with the solemnity of graves round about, the activity of the service within. It is the only building in the valley upon which he has applied elegance, and its spire therefore reaches a little higher than it seems to reach. Its bells greet from afar his going thither on a clear Sunday morning, and he always lifts his hat to them, as if he would tell them a "How do you do!" There is an understanding between him and them, which no one knows.¹¹

Since religion was the form of cultural expression common to almost all people, romanticism naturally exhibited itself powerfully in that sphere. But here it is necessary to distinguish two very different movements, separate at first, but interacting and tending to approach one another,—namely the spontaneous revival among the masses, and the reversion of upper-class religion to more primitive forms.

In general, the revivalistic movements among the common people of Scandinavia resembled similar movements elsewhere. Since they usually developed without benefit of clergy, they varied from straight-laced orthodoxy in doctrine and ceremonial, to extreme heresy and the most unconventional service. What was common to them all was their spontaneous origin, their sincerity, their primitive emotionalism, and their emphasis upon the virtues best suited to the emergent capitalism of the age.

Various factors combined to produce this religious awakening of the Scandinavian masses and to give it distinctive char-

acter. It is usually termed a reaction against sterile rationalistic preaching; but that seems an unsatisfactory explanation in view of the known fact that comparatively few clergymen preached anything but the old Lutheran doctrine. The revivalists were at first hardly conscious of the existence of rationalism. Only after it was well started, did it discover a new enemy in neology, but then, to be sure, that particular enmity became an obsession. The movement may much more accurately be described as evidence of a socio-economic development which was sweeping the heretofore inarticulate rural population into the advancing stream of European civilization. In so far as it was a protest, it protested against the bone-dry, devitalized spirit of the orthodox and the rationalistic clergy alike. In reality it was less a protest than an assertion of the peasantry's newly discovered vitality.

Rural society, at the opening of the nineteenth century, was still primitive, but it had begun a very notable development.¹² This fact is basic to an understanding of the popular religious movement. In almost all Scandinavian rural communities, and especially those of the mountains and the forests, where news from the outside world was seldom received, religion could develop no more rapidly than other aspects of civilization. The popular mind there still accepted much of the ancient pagan folk-superstition. Indeed it has frequently been remarked that, until the late eighteenth century, the mass of the Scandinavian population had never experienced a true religious awakening. Christianity had been introduced by compulsion; Lutheranism had been dictated by the state. Neither had sprung from a deeply felt popular need for religious expression. Lutheran Christianity was still, in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, heavily tinged with animistic hold-overs. The mountains and waterfalls were peopled with trolls and sprites who could either help or harm. New-born children had to be protected from these beings by pieces of steel as well as by prayers. Wolves were objects of dread to pregnant women. All cabalistic precautions were taken by the old women who attended at the birth of Carl von Linné.¹³ This ancient body of folksuperstition existed peaceably alongside the body of elementary Christian teaching which the people had assimilated throughout the centuries. The one had colored the other until

there seemed to be no essential conflict between them. In the peasant paintings of Dalarne (Sweden), Biblical characters were clothed in the native Scandinavian costumes, and were imagined to speak the vernacular of the common people, just as in *Green Pastures* God is depicted as a masterful colored gentleman. No great religious movement could possibly begin much above this cultural level.

The insularity of Scandinavian rural society accounts for much of the elementary character of the revival. But the growing technological and organizational transformation imparted impetus. The rural world was opening up. The craving for news was very great. Travellers were never so welcome, and itinerant preachers carried news as well as a religious message. The church had always been the great news agency of the countryside, the center of the community. Religious services and meetings afforded opportunities for visitors to see and be seen. In this respect Scandinavian rural society and the American frontier were similar. When the circuit rider or the itinerant preacher arrived, such a community flocked to the center of attraction. Thus new highways and the generally improving methods of communication permitted the religious revival vast growth.

Another interesting similarity between the socio-economic transition and the religious awakening is their drift toward individualism. In the former the communal organization of rural society gave way to the ownership and enterprise of capitalism. More and more the character of the individual formed the basis of his material success. The virtues that promoted his individual welfare,—industry, thrift, ingenuity, and sobriety,—grew increasingly more important.¹⁴ Religion under the old socio-economic structure had been a matter of adherence to a stable institution. Individual conversion, a highly personal relationship to God, had been less important. But now, as that society disintegrated and placed a growing emphasis upon individual self-dependence, religion necessarily became a more personal concern. Hence the religious revival insisted upon an intimate relationship of the individual with God, upon a fundamental individual religious experience. All of this must begin with a personal conversion. To produce this conversion the revival developed its peculiar psychological technique:

emphasis at first upon sin and upon impending doom, development of the individual's fear for the safety of his soul, despair, and then presentation of the way of salvation. The whole process was likely to be colored by suggestive ecstatic behavior. Inevitably, when the emphasis was thus placed upon individual conversion, and especially since the movement was led by laymen who lacked the standardizing dogma of the official clergy, there was great danger of sectarianism. The established churches were quite justified in their fear that lay preachers would produce religious chaos.

The struggle between the peasantry and the upper classes also went far toward making the religious revival of the masses what it was.¹⁵ It has been pointed out that this antipathy had long been a feature of Scandinavian social development, and that it moved toward a climax in the first half of the nineteenth century. The official clergy were too completely identified with the dominant social classes to escape the effects of this current. The religious revival was the most aggressive assertion of a lower-class cultural autonomy. Through it the laity expressed their determination to decide for themselves where lay the essence of religion. This the official clergy could not countenance and appealed to the public authorities for assistance. From time to time, therefore, the formidable machinery of the state was turned upon the revivalists, especially in Norway and Sweden. But the ultimate result was only to align those religious groups with the liberal democratic political movement. This alignment prevented a possible cleavage of the lower-class political rising, and, instead, imparted to that rising the vitally important moral sanction of religion. This was true not only regarding freedom of worship, for the other more secular objectives of the rural and urban proletariat also acquired a deep ethical significance.

A few more immediate circumstances back of the religious awakening require description. An exceedingly important factor was the increase of literacy.¹⁶ Every community had people who could use the printed page. The Bible and the books of prayer had been set up by the Lutheran churches as the final authorities in doctrine and great efforts had been expended in teaching the laity to use them. Religious books were almost the only printed literature they had, and once the

revivalistic movement got under way these were scarce. But it has always proved dangerous for orthodoxy to give books to the laity and thus help every man to become his own interpreter, his own priest. Heterodoxy almost certainly results. It was no accident that in Sweden the revivalists, whatever their doctrine and practice, were called "Readers" (*Läsare*), a term also common in Norway. The institution of confirmation was a further important factor in preparing the common people for active participation in religious life. As an indoctrinating device its efficacy was almost unsurpassed. Young people, between the impressionable ages of fourteen and sixteen, were put through a course of preparation based upon the Bible, the Catechism, and the Explanation, at the end of which there occurred a solemn ceremonial at the morning service when the confirmands were subjected to public examination, repeated the vows of baptism, and for the first time shared in the sacrament of the altar. There are few Scandinavians who have not seen whole congregations in tears upon such an occasion.¹⁷ The institution of confirmation was in a large measure responsible for keeping the religious revival in the main within the framework of the established church. Furthermore, it emphasized the importance of religious literature.

The publication of such books had long been almost the only profitable branch of the book trade. But at the opening of the nineteenth century the demand for Bibles increased tremendously. To satisfy it, and with no motive of profit, foreign Bible societies were formed. The American Quaker missionary, Stephen Grellet, who visited Norway and Sweden in 1818, probably exaggerated when he wrote that among forty thousand people in Stavanger Amt, Norway, "it is thought that fifty Bibles could hardly be found among them all; indeed money cannot procure them here";¹⁸ but he found it very easy to distribute his books. The British and Foreign Bible Society, formed at London in 1804, quickly set offshoots. The Swedish Evangelical Society was formed in Stockholm in 1808, the Swedish Bible Society in 1815, the Danish Bible Society in 1814, the Norwegian Bible Society in 1814; and local societies were formed in Norway as the result of a journey undertaken by Dr. Paterson of Edinburgh in 1832.¹⁹ Within the next few decades the Scandinavian countries were deluged with millions

of Bibles, Old Testaments, New Testaments, and tracts. Hardly a single home was missed, until it became a public disgrace for a family to be without at least a Bible and a hymnary. To that shattered, shell-shocked age, groping frantically for the great unifying principle of all things, it seemed for a time as though it had been found in the Bible. Upon it, perhaps, could be built a harmonious universe.²⁰

The Danish popular revival probably began in 1799, but the exact date is uncertain. It is interesting to note that it started and attained its greatest intensity in Jutland, where the agricultural economy was most individualized. For a few years the revival was limited to two parishes and centered about a peasant named Peter Laurssen, and a servant, Jens Anderssen. The immediate cause seems to have been the introduction of the revised devotional books. One group maintained that the new hymnary must be doctrinally unsound, "since there was less singing about the devil than formerly." The pastors in both parishes were vigorously denounced for alleged heresy, card-playing, and generally sinful lives. Only one of them showed some understanding of the revival, and thereafter fared somewhat better at the hands of the enthusiasts. The official classes viewed the phenomenon as either "pure insanity," or as "the product of the congenital defiance of the commonalty against preachers and government."²¹ In spite of fines and persecutions, the peasants in this district succeeded in stopping the introduction of the new prayer books. The movement nevertheless remained relatively weak for several years, lacking such powerful leadership as Norway had in Hans Nielsen Hauge. The Danish group was visited in 1803 by Ole Olesen Bakke, one of Hauge's emissaries, and the next year by Hauge himself. But they failed utterly to arouse the fervor that Hauge did at home. Friendly relations between the Danish and Norwegian movements were established, however, which lasted for over thirty years.²²

"The strong Jutlanders" (*De stærke Jyder*), or "the godly," as they were popularly called, grew stronger after 1811, when the economic crisis raised the cost of the new prayerbooks. Then a wave of protest swept over the traditionally tight-fisted peninsula, which eventually found able leadership in a crofter, Christen Madsen. Madsen had been a merry soul until his sud-

den conversion on the convenient date of the king's birthday, January 28, 1819. The transformation in his habits was very impressive. He preached a gospel of special conversion and saintly living which attracted many followers and excited venomous dislike from the average sinner. Women were here, as elsewhere in Scandinavia, particularly prone to fanaticism. "The godly" often refused to send their children to school because they were taught false doctrine and such worldly subjects as gymnastics. Frequently they declined to permit them to be confirmed by the pastors, because the latter might be unregenerate and the children would have to study heretical books. Local authorities were much embarrassed by these problems, because the objectors were so obviously sincere and so exemplary in their conduct. The clergy, as a rule, demanded the full application of the law, particularly fines for failure to attend schools. The many fines inflicted had no effect whatever upon the resistance of the peasants. Finally the Copenhagen government hit upon the idea of permitting the leaders to confirm their children according to the old books, and that satisfied them somewhat. But very often the Conventicle Act of 1741 was invoked to forbid their meetings. Mobs frequently attacked the pious assemblies, and when they requested protection from the authorities, they were told to stop meeting if they wished to be let alone.²³

The Jutlanders soon began to extend their activities to the island of Funen every summer, and from there the movement spread to other islands. Christen Madsen flouted the vagrancy laws and walked all over the kingdom conducting private revivals. He acquired a worthy assistant and successor in Peter Larsen Skråppenborg, whose name and figure were soon familiar in every hamlet. As long as the assemblies were persecuted by the officials extreme fanaticism continued. Some persecution was practiced until about 1840, but in 1824 the government and the church administration advised the pastors to depend more upon persuasion and Scripture than upon the police in dealing with the "misguided" members of their flocks. Thereafter there was less trouble and less fury. Crown Prince Christian Frederick, as Governor of Funen, humanely instructed his police to extend the equal protection of the law to "the godly" and to other citizens. The revival continued to

develop during the eighteen twenties and 'thirties, the number of revivalistic meetings and journeys assuming spectacular proportions. A deputy to the Roskilde Estates in 1839 reported that shortly before he had left home no less than sixty persons had crossed from Langeland to Funen to conduct revivals. About 1825, a rapprochement began between the popular revival and the Grundtvig forces. Grundtvig's movement was distinctly of and within the church,²⁴ but it shared many features of a popular revival. As early as 1817, the pastor at Kjerteminde, J. Paludan-Müller, recognized the similarity by referring to the popular revival as "Grundtvigism," a reference which was entirely mistaken, however, for Grundtvig had nothing then to do with it. Grundtvig's religious writings, nevertheless, found many readers and admirers among "the godly," and when he published his polemic against H. N. Clausen in 1825, Skræppenborg himself began to recommend his works. In 1837, he went to Copenhagen to talk with Grundtvig, for he had heard what Grundtvig had said in derogation of the private revivalistic meetings. The two men disagreed on this point but remained friends. From that time forward, "the godly" tended to return to the church. They often found the younger preachers friendly to their movement, and it became evident, especially with the advent of the Baptists, that the private meetings, where they could never partake of the sacraments, could not fully satisfy the religious needs of the pious. There was a danger therefore that such openly dissenting sects as the Baptists might make inroads among the frequenters of private revivals. All of Grundtvig's mounting influence was directed toward making the Church sufficiently spacious to accommodate the diverse forms of popular religious feeling. Thus the revival from the top of the social structure was able to merge with the surge from below, and the religious unity of the Danish people was preserved within the framework of the state church.²⁵

The Baptists were almost the only dissenting sect to gain even a small foothold among the Danish people. This doctrine was imported in 1839 by a sailor who had learned it in America, and found its supporters chiefly in Copenhagen. Bishop Mynster, with the ready assistance of the civil authorities, proceeded against them with vigor. In 1840, the dissolution of

their congregations was ordered and all proselyting forbidden, Their leaders were thrown into prison, where Elizabeth Fry found them upon her visit to the Copenhagen penal institutions in 1841. Her intercession for them at Court and the tolerance of Christian VIII helped them but little, for the next year, on Christmas eve, parents were enjoined to have their children baptized within a certain time, and refusal would result in forfeiture of their guardianship over the children and forcible baptism of the latter. A lively dispute ensued about the propriety of this measure, several clergymen with viewpoints as widely divergent as those of P. C. Kierkegaard, the Grundtvigian Emil Clausen, brother of H. N. Clausen, Grundtvig himself, and H. N. Clausen, either censuring the decree or refusing point blank to perform compulsory baptism. These highly unsavory ceremonies nevertheless continued to be performed upon the insistence of the bishop, until the democratic constitution of 1849 established full religious freedom.²⁰ Mormonism gained many more adherents in Denmark than in either of the two other countries but failed to make any permanent breach in Danish Lutheranism.

The Haugean Movement in Norway presents certain unique characteristics. It has usually been described as a popular refusal to accept the neology of the rationalistic clergy.²⁷ Norway's foremost historian, Professor Halvdan Koht, has pronounced this view untenable.²⁸ He maintains that in 1796 there were as yet comparatively few rationalistic pastors in Norway, that Hauge directed his barbs primarily at the prevailing uninspired orthodoxy, and that it was only in its later phase that the revival became anti-rationalistic. In view of the known condition of the Norwegian church, this seems a far more reasonable explanation. Hauge's earliest writings, furthermore, are not concerned with neology, but insist upon a personal relationship between the individual and his God, something which orthodox Lutheranism had ceased to emphasize. Nor was Hauge's way as completely unprepared as his enthusiastic admirers have held. The pietists and the rationalists had carried religious education to a comparatively high pitch. Here and there, throughout the country, the Herrnhuters had established small colonies of religiously awakened persons who were ready to welcome his preaching and who frequently formed

the nuclei from which his movement spread. Nevertheless, Hauge himself always denounced the degeneracies with which Herrnhutism had become somewhat affected.

Hans Nielsen Hauge was born near Sarpsborg, in 1771, and grew up in a pious home. His youthful hypersensitivity to all things religious was intensified by his near death from drowning when thirteen years old. He read everything of a religious nature that he could lay his hands upon, and finally became convinced that he had a great call from God to preach the gospel to his countrymen. So great was the call that he had to preach, ordained or not. That call made him an involuntary hero, able to withstand in quiet dignity every hardship and persecution. He began his work in 1796, going from home to home and place to place, always leaving behind him a few people who had been "awakened." As a personality he was plain but intense, rigorously puritanical in his own life but none-the-less modest, sincere but charitable. He was very practical, an excellent enterprising business man who placed godliness first. He took very seriously the biblical pronouncement that "all government is ordained of God"; hence he diligently avoided every possible conflict with political authorities. But still more sacred he held the injunction to "obey God more than men"; hence only imprisonment could prevent him from preaching. No consideration of honor, pleasure, or profit could swerve him a hairsbreadth from his course. Among his friends he aroused an almost hysterical loyalty.

His preaching was unconsciously but admirably suited to the intellectual level of his hearers. He might quietly enter a house on his wanderings, eat the simple food of his host, relate what news he had, and ask permission to read a passage of Scripture. His good voice, his utter simplicity, his patent earnestness almost always won the adherence of that family. Then would follow an invitation to remain a while, and a somewhat larger inspirational meeting in the same house. Simple, everyday illustrations would bring the lesson home with vivid force; there were few meetings in which he did not draw tears of repentance or of joy. The next day, if he remained in the neighborhood, he would participate in the day's work, incidentally offering shrewd practical advice calculated to increase production and profits. Usually he left behind him after such a visit

some one person of influence and authority who could serve as elder to his flock. And occasionally he was able to recruit a lay preacher of ability to assist him in his mission. For eight years he traveled up and down Norway; there were few communities he did not visit.

Such work must involve him with the authorities. By his strictures upon the indolence, gaiety, and uppishness of the official clergy he drew upon himself their wrath. It was impossible for them to convict him of heresy, for he was scrupulously Lutheran, but he was repeatedly arrested for vagrancy and for violation of the Conventicle Act of 1741. His many followers, and others too, in all parts of Norway viewed this persecution as evidence of the well known disposition of the officials to lord it over the peasantry. They well remembered that their champion, Christian Lofthuus, was even then languishing in the prison at Akershus.

Finally he began to engage in economic activity which at several points violated mercantilistic legislation. His keen sense for the practical convinced him that the "Friends," as he termed his followers, could best help one another by establishing sound business enterprises. For himself he selected trade, and soon had a flourishing coastwise commerce in and out of Bergen. He helped the "Friends" dispose profitably of their products and supplied them with the necessities which they did not produce. His profits and such money as his followers chose to invest with him, or give him to manage, he used to buy farms and fishing stations, establish factories, and develop his trade. He even made sure of a printing house. All of these enterprises he staffed with loyal "awakened" people, and by 1804 he had a widely ramified economic organization, doing a highly diversified business. As first conceived the system was communistic, but upon being told by an official that this would be unlawful, Hauge dropped that feature. There was probably not a more honest man in the kingdom than Hans Nielsen Hauge, but his system of book-keeping was certainly loose, which gave his enemies occasion to spread suspicion that he was using his religious activity to camouflage large-scale swindling. This, coupled with the facts that he confined his system to no one kind of enterprise and that his people violated the sacred principle of remaining with their traditional occu-

pations, for the most part agriculture, gave the eager authorities cause for his final detention.²⁹

In 1804 he was arrested, as so often before, but this time he was not released, for the chancellery in Copenhagen ordered him held pending the results of an investigation. Not until January, 1808, did the commission report and prefer charges. On December 4, 1813, he was convicted and sentenced to two years at hard labor, which the court of appeal reduced to a fine. At first his imprisonment was so severe as to ruin his health. But in 1806 he began to enjoy many privileges, and in 1809 the government, recognizing his business genius, released him that he might contribute to the relief of the salt famine resulting from the English blockade by founding salt factories. In 1811 Hauge was practically set free.³⁰ Meanwhile a considerable change had come over the clergy and the bureaucracy. The desperate position of Norway between 1807 and 1814 gave irresistible momentum to the nationalistic movement which culminated in the Eidsvold Assembly and the declaration of independence in 1814. To achieve the supremely necessary national unity the bureaucracy began to cater to the peasantry. Furthermore, even the upper classes were reverting to more fundamentalistic religious formulas. As a consequence, it was but rarely after 1814 that the authorities interfered with the Haugean lay preachers.

Hauge himself, after 1811, remained quietly on his farm but continued to direct his movement. There was no abatement of religious awakening. The number of "saints" continued to grow, and everywhere they formed more or less well defined groups, but always within the state church. The official clergy found it increasingly advisable to lean upon them, and they usually became the most active congregational members. Thus, as in Denmark, there occurred a gradual meeting of the revival from the bottom and the revival from the top. Instead of his struggle with the authorities, Hauge now began to face the serious problem of dissension within his own ranks. The older Haugeans attempted to maintain an iron discipline to which the younger people objected. Until Hauge's death in 1824, this policy was reasonably successful, but there appeared no one strong enough to succeed him. The result was that radical factions moved toward an open breach with

the established church. They were often marked by pentecostalism and antinomianism. Knut Kittelsen Spödcervold, who had never been a Haugean, began in 1825 to preach the doctrine that a Christian, once converted, was placed above the moral law. A few years later Hans Feigum, who had been a Haugean, began a revivalistic movement on a very low plane. It attained some real strength in at least two provinces. One of Feigum's "saints," Ole Sörflaten, was particularly successful in persuading women to join his "spiritual union," but the fifty-odd resulting children, the so-called "Sörflaten brats," proved that the unions were not always merely spiritual. He was finally sent to prison for two and a half years and there cured of his "religious" propensities.³¹

The adoption of complete religious freedom in 1845 opened the door to all sorts of sectarianism. Revivalistic vagaries flourished more than ever, now especially in the economically backward regions. The Quaker community at Stavanger, founded by a group of sailors who had been converted on board an English prison ship between 1809 and 1814, though visited and strengthened by Stephen Grellett in 1818, largely disappeared, partly by emigration, partly by absorption.³² The Catholic church established the first of its congregations in Oslo in 1853, and spread slowly into the larger cities. The Methodists, who appeared in the 'fifties, made so many converts in all parts of the country that they exerted some influence upon the clergy of the established church. Mormonism made less headway than in either Sweden or Denmark, and the Baptists, who only began their missionary work in 1865, enjoyed no appreciable progress. Despite the appearance of these sects, the overwhelming majority of the Norwegian people remained true to the state church.³³

The Haugean revival was a social movement of first importance. It continued the tradition of the enlightenment in practical affairs, inculcating initiative, thrift, and intensity of work. It glorified the average man. Fundamentally it contributed to the most important current in contemporary western civilization,—the rise of the lower middle class. Both in composition and attitude it reflected this tendency. For the most part it was joined by the independent peasantry; only in the areas where social stratification had not proceeded far, principally

the west coast, did crofters and laborers enter it in any numbers. Inevitably it must reflect the attitude of its membership, which was anti-authoritarian and democratic. Here again it continued what the enlightenment had begun and what was basic in previous Norwegian social evolution. Hitherto the clergy had belonged to the authoritarian system, together with the bureaucracy. When Hauge's laymen declared their independence of clerical authority in matters of religion, the self-assertion of the peasants against restrictive political authority followed naturally.¹¹ The Hauge movement, therefore, was a very important stage in the perennial revolt of the peasants against the upper classes. Unlike the earlier sporadic revolts it was a national and continuous sweep. For the first time a national peasant organization had been effected. Culturally, too, it represented an important transitional stage. The old communal peasant culture, its beauties along with its anachronisms, broke down before the tidal wave of religious interest.

The great awakening which now occurred, like all similar revivalistic paroxysms, brought in its wake much that was grotesque and abnormal. The clergy were not infrequently right when they spoke of "fanaticism." Everything which seems conducive to worldly pleasure and joy was denounced as sinful, and many a cultural treasure was thus destroyed. The fiddlers burned their instruments, the ballad singers began to chant only hymns, at feasts and festivals there was to be no telling of folk-tales or stories of olden days, much less games and dancing and other amusements, but only sanctimonious conferences. Merely from the viewpoint of religious history it would seem proper to say that the Hauge movement completed what rationalism had begun,—the destruction of all ancient superstition. Taken as a whole, much of the traditional in peasant culture was broken down; dark shadows fell upon the joyous spirit and the love of art which had recently been a peculiar characteristic of peasant society.¹⁵

The culture of the religious awakening was in itself no great improvement over what it supplanted, but it was far more in harmony with the rest of the western world. Its literature was most elementary, but absolutely essential; hence elementary education became one of its favorite causes. The second and third generations which were seldom satisfied with merely religious literature, gradually reached toward contemporary secular culture.

The Swedish revivalistic movement possessed no organiza-

tional genius comparable to Hans Nielsen Hauge. Therefore it presents no such uniform characteristics as across the boundary. To a much larger extent it was influenced by British and especially American missionary activity, but its background and origin were much the same. Hauge sent his personal representative, Jon Haugvaldstad, on a journey into the Gothenburg region in 1822, where he established cordial relations with some of the Schartaun pastors and layfolk, but the Norwegian movement was too definitely marked by national peculiarities to become a force in either Sweden or Denmark, despite the close political relations of Norway and Sweden.³⁶

Although Stephen Grellet found no such "openings" for spiritual meetings in Sweden as in Norway,³⁷ the revivalist movement was already then under way in certain districts. As a matter of fact there had for over a century occurred sporadic, local revivals, especially in the province of Norrland. Several factors combined to predispose the Norrlanders to an aggravated form of mysticism. Winter days are long and dark, the midnight sun spreads an eerie light over summer nights. The growing season is short, intense, almost voluptuous. Nature is so capricious that good luck or divine providence becomes almost as important as the very seed. The sparse settlements were then separated by mountains, deep forests, and mighty torrents. Many of the settlers had drifted in from Lappland and Finland, where mystery and primitive magic were even more firmly entrenched than in the rest of the Scandinavian rural population. Here, as elsewhere in Sweden, and in all of Scandinavia, groups of Herrnhuters and other pietists had been quietly working for a more spontaneous Christianity based upon the Bible. Rationalistic theology had little or no influence. The pastors of the state church often lived slothfully, even grossly, and preached formalistic, orthodox sermons utterly devoid of inspiration. There were notable exceptions, of course, to whose sermons people would go many miles. But they were ordinarily viewed by their fellow-clergymen as meddlers.³⁸ The Norrland area resembled a frontier community; the communal village type of agriculture had not reached the degree of development that it had on the plains of Scania, or even in the more hilly middle regions; the individual stood far more alone. It was against this sociological background

that the *läsare* appeared in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

There was nothing schismatic or separatistic about this movement. Hence its representatives and their successors, direct and spiritual, were called *gammalläsarne* (the old readers) in contradistinction to the *nya läsarne* (the new readers), or simply *läsarne* (the readers), who arose after 1830. They used Lutheran texts. They were also, generally speaking, less fanatical than the later movement, although there were many meetings where the participants behaved like "holy rollers." They invariably preached the necessity of an individual conversion, and they placed far more emphasis than the established church upon exemplary living.³⁹ Bishop Wingård, one of the princes of the Swedish church, wrote in 1831, that

The "old readers" in Norrland and Elfsborg provinces were, as nearly as I have been able to learn, pious Christians, who were troubled by the decay of the church and who turned to the writings of Luther, which they diligently read since they could be found in all churches. Had they been let alone to their quiet domestic devotions, they would undoubtedly have done much good and would have aroused their environs.⁴⁰

The revivalistic stream broadened slowly before 1830 and thereafter spread rapidly.

Then it began to be fed by more ample wellsprings arising out of Swedish life, and by confluence with similar foreign currents. The former arose from no specially new or different circumstances; they were due to causes already described which had long been operative. The improved political position of the peasantry after 1809, the harrowing experiences of the nation in the wars, the loss of Finland, the peace crisis, and the general reaction against rationalism contributed some impetus, but they were not fundamental. Of real importance, though generally overlooked by religious historians, was the all-transforming socio-economic revolution.

The man who more than anyone else joined the native and the foreign religious movements was the Wesleyan preacher in Stockholm, George Scott. His predecessor for four years, Joseph Rayner Stephens, never played the same role. Both men were brought to Stockholm to serve as chaplains to Samuel Owen's colony of British workmen. Scott was born in Edin-

burgh and was twenty-six years of age upon his arrival in 1830. Within a year he had learned enough Swedish to preach in that language, and from that time until 1842 he was prominent in the religious and ethical revival.⁴¹ He preached in the typical Wesleyan revivalist manner. Large crowds came to hear him. With British and American revivalist groups he corresponded actively, and visited them to raise money for his mission. Within a short time he had become acquainted, either directly or by correspondence, with many of the leading *läsare*, who looked to him for inspiration and guidance. His chapel in Stockholm became the center of their movement. This eminence was possible for him, a foreigner, only because he carefully abstained from advocating separatism. The religious awakening was enough. His valuable services in the Bible societies and the Temperance Society won him the respect of prominent state churchmen like Johan Olof Wallin, Frans Mikael Franzén, and Per Wieselgren. But he made enemies, too. Many clergymen, together with the bon-vivants and the grosser mob, took offense at his sharp reprimands. In 1841, when visiting the United States to collect money, he was quoted in the Swedish press as having made disparaging remarks about the Swedish people. The resulting hue and cry culminated in a mob attack on his chapel during Palm Sunday services, 1842. Scott barely escaped alive. Unable to secure police protection, he was forced to leave the country.⁴² His work was fraught with momentous results. He had partly unified the popular religious movement and influenced most of the men who now came forward to lead it. During his last year he had founded *Pietisten*, the journal about which the revival was henceforth centered.

Scott departed, but his work was continued by the layman, Carl Olof Rosenius (1816-1868). Rosenius was a typical *läsare*, who had undergone a severe religious crisis, and to whom the Bible was the only infallible authority. He remained faithful to the state church for the same reasons as George Scott, hoping to reform it from within, but he would not seek ordination because he wished to remain free. As editor of *Pietisten* he took up the work of Scott, and under his leadership the revival not only continued but broadened. He maintained all the foreign contacts established by his master and won the adherence

of many notables, including the hymnologist Lina Sandell and the opera singer Oscar Ahnfelt. The latter put the verses of Lina Sandell to music and travelled about the country in full gentleman's style with his guitar teaching *läsare* groups to sing. When Jenny Lind returned to Sweden as the songbird of the world, she openly espoused their cause. Scott had founded the Swedish Missionary Society in 1835, an agency which devoted itself to inner, as well as foreign, missionary activity. Under Rosenius's leadership this interest grew until it culminated in the organization of the National Evangelical Foundation (*Evangeliska Fosterlandsstiftelsen*) in 1856, which thereafter functioned as the central office of the Swedish revival. As in Norway, Denmark, the British Isles, and the United States, the 1850's brought the movement to a climax. Thousands of families were enlisted under its banners. Laymen's preaching attained spectacular proportions, and the distribution of tracts followed high-pressure business methods.⁴³ The religious life of the Swedish people was transformed. Even upon many of the pastors of the state church the National Evangelical Foundation, its journal *Budbäraren* (*The Messenger*), and Rosenius's *Family Prayer Book* exerted a profound influence.⁴⁴

It goes without saying that in a movement of such scope not all details and aspects could conform to established standards. When allowances are made for the breach of tradition which widespread lay activity naturally entailed, it may still be said that the fundamental aspects of the revival preserved the dignity inherent in Lutheranism. But certain aberrations threw shadows over all. In the first two decades of the nineteenth century there were a number of prophetesses in Östergötland and Småland. The most notable were Lisa Petersdotter, whom her followers called "God's Lady," and Helena Sofia Ekblom, known variously as "Preacher Lena" (*Predikare Lena*) and "The White Virgin" (*Hvita Jungfrun*). The latter was judged insane and, according to the current brutal practice, chained to her cell.⁴⁵ In 1841 there appeared in Småland an ecstatic revival, which attracted widespread attention. It differed from the normal *läsare* type by the physical jerkings to which people succumbed in meeting. The *läsare* explained the phenomenon by saying that the Holy Spirit proved too powerful; the government assigned the problem to its provin-

cial physicians who diagnosed it as an epidemic of St. Vitus Dance combined with religious exaltation, and coined for it the scientific name of *chorea cum exaltatione religiosa*.⁴⁶

Another aberrant phenomenon was Eric-Jansonism. Eric Janson was a serious-minded farmer who experienced a conversion at the age of twenty-two. At first he carried on the relatively unobtrusive work of an ordinary *läsare* and remained on good terms with his pastor. But Eric Janson gradually developed the doctrine that the true Christian is not only absolved from the wages of sin but from sin itself. Therewith he left Lutheranism. He moved into Hälsingland and Dalarna, developing a provocative type of preaching which repeatedly led the authorities to break up his meetings under the Conventicle Act of 1726. His followers were fanatically loyal, and families sometimes were broken up. After two years of bitter persecution, Janson decided to emigrate with his flock to the United States, and in 1846 there began the first mass emigration from Sweden. Feeling ran very high. Eric Janson himself slipped across the Norwegian boundary on skis. Property was sold at sacrifice, the proceeds put into a common fund, passage paid for over a thousand persons, and a communistic colony founded at Bishop Hill, Illinois,⁴⁷ where Janson ruled as autocratic prophet.

With the exception of Jansonism, the revivalistic activities in Sweden remained fairly well within the fold of the official Lutheran church. The Wesleyan influence was strong, due to Scott and Rosenius, but not separatistic. In September, 1848, the first Baptist congregation was organized at Borekulla in Halland by a Danish minister, A. P. Förster. But for several years the real leader of the Swedish Baptist movement had been gradually preparing himself. He was a sailor, Frederik Olaus Nilsson (1809-1881), who had been much influenced by the Baptist seamen's mission in New York. Finally he was immersed in the Elbe river at Hamburg in 1847, and thereafter devoted himself wholeheartedly to the work of conversion in his native land. On New Year's Day, 1850, a Gothenburg mob attacked his meeting and the authorities intervened. Nilsson was sentenced to exile. After a troubled sojourn in Copenhagen, he and a score of other Swedish Baptists emigrated to America, where Nilsson became a circuit rider. His work in

Sweden was continued by a cultivated university man, Anders Wiberg, a friend of George Scott and Rosenius, who had also spent some time in America. In 1857, there were forty-five congregations with 2,105 members; in 1862, 150 congregations with 4,853 members; and in 1864, 172 congregations with 6,411 members.¹⁸ The Baptist sect gained much favor by its active work for temperance. When in 1858 and 1860 the Conventicle Act was practically repealed, there were no longer any insurmountable hindrances to its growth. Mormonism gained some adherents, most of whom emigrated. Methodism of the American, separatistic type made its appearance in 1867 and enjoyed active development.

The Swedish revival, it has been said, received powerful influences from Britain and America. The latter was particularly strong. Though the Bible societies and the tract movement were either offshoots or imitations of similar British institutions, and although George Scott was a Britisher, most of the subsequent foreign influences were American. Swedish political liberals idealized the United States,⁴⁰ and religious leaders were constantly referring to the free, spontaneous, sincere godliness of America. Many of the latter spoke from personal observation. The letters which emigrants sent home blessed the religious freedom of their new country, which had no official church, no Conventicle Act, never invoked the law against the godly. The religious literature of American Baptists and Methodists was translated and widely disseminated in Sweden, especially in the late 1850's.

Unlike the parish pastors, who despised the American religious influence, Rosenius and the free-church people saw in the United States the most Christian country in the world and were not ashamed to acknowledge indebtedness to their brethren in America for inspiration, example, and material support.⁶⁰

The result was a demand to separate the godly from the state church, or rather to separate church and state. Prior to 1865 this demand was relatively weak, but it had been growing rapidly in the two previous decades.⁶¹

Another consequence of the American influence, which however also had other more fundamental causes, was the ethical system developed by the *läsare*, or, as they had begun to be called before 1865, the free-church elements. Whereas

the old Lutheran pietism as reflected in the "old *läsare*" stood primarily for a somber, negativistic, other-worldly attitude toward life in this vale of tears, the reformed Calvinist religious forces emphasized a special calling, or duty, to be performed in this world. The temperance cause was thus viewed with special favor, so also the improvement of sex morals. Furthermore, if the awakened Christian were to improve his society he must be able to influence the government, hence the religious independents supported the democratic political movement.⁵² Merely to make money, but not to enjoy it, that is, enterprising industry and thrift, the very essence of capitalism, might be the Christian's special calling. It is not strange, therefore, that the revivalistic movements

brought into being a sober, industrious and thrifty people, within whose ranks a very high degree of prosperity quickly arose. From these thoughtful and enterprising circles have emanated many of our country's most successful business men.⁵³

It is easy to exaggerate the American influence, however. Both Norway and Denmark, where it was far weaker, developed the same tendencies. Indeed, they were inherent in the cultural and social condition of all three countries. It was primarily a rural peasant movement; when the Swedish ecclesiastical and political officials used the Conventicle Act to suppress religious meetings the effect was the same as in Norway and Denmark,—the peasants merely got another reason to press their struggle for political power. Bishop Wingård described a particularly prominent *läsare* in Gothenburg diocese, J. Torbjörnsson, as "a hater of gentlemen", a hatred inherited, he thought, from his grandfather, Lars Torbjörnsson, who had been chairman of the peasants' chamber in the *riksdag*.⁵⁴ This same prelate, who dreaded the awakening political consciousness of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry, disliked the popular revival largely because it was so obviously a class movement. He held it particularly iniquitous of the revivalist, Hoof, that he "spoke the peasant dialect from the pulpit."⁵⁵ In many respects the "apostacy" of Geijer from conservatism to liberalism foreshadowed the amalgamation of political liberalism and revivalism.⁵⁶ Quite apart from any American influence the revival represented an important swing

of the lower-class cultural stream. The effects were the same in Sweden as those described by Koht in Norway.⁵⁷ Not even the progress of the temperance movement or of education, can be ascribed primarily to the American influence, for back of each were compelling economic and social forces.

III. THE UPPER CLASS RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

The religion of the dominant classes was far more than among the lower classes colored by the reaction against rationalism. Its leaders had without exception been educated in universities. They felt the ebb and flow of world thought. Some of them were not merely representatives of the Church, but active members of the philosophical community. They had studied Kant, they read Fichte, Schelling and Schleiermacher. They were often themselves authors and poets who expressed the deepest sentiments of the new age. Their reasons for sponsoring religious orthodoxy were frequently stated in highly intellectual terms. But there were plenty of other materials at hand for a religious reaction, even among the upper classes. The cruder forms of prevalent mysticism have already been described.⁵⁸ The firm hold of Lutheran orthodoxy upon most of the pastors and the vast majority of the laity preserved them in "the true faith." All that was needed to make this formalistic faith warm and glowing was the spirit of romanticism. The governments, whose chief concern during and immediately after an orgy of revolution was to preserve the *status quo*, saw in a revived orthodoxy within the framework of the state churches an excellent instrument of social control. Faith in the old Lutheran doctrine and loyalty to the existing government were usually found together. The Swedish autocrat Gustav IV was inoculated by his tutor, the very orthodox court pastor Flodin, with an obscurantist hatred for neology, which, although not rooted in the new philosophy, encouraged the religious that were.⁵⁹ He was overthrown in 1809 by those who were least affected by the reaction against rationalism. In 1825 the Danish autocrat Frederick VI showed appreciation of Grundtvig's position on the absolute authority of the king when he silenced his opponent, A. S. Örsted.⁶⁰

From the religious viewpoint, there is probably not as much difference between the old orthodoxy and neology as between

the old orthodoxy and romanticism. The two former, after all, are based upon a purely intellectual concept of religion, that is, reason determines their dogmatic content. Romanticism brought an emotional approach to religion, described it as essentially a feeling, or an attitude, something of value *per se* quite apart from any dogma or any utilitarian purpose; it viewed religion as a fundamental human experience. Consequently, romanticism was not in essence as one-sidedly reactionary in its religious expression as has often been assumed. If the individual were but capable of sincere religious feeling his dogma mattered little to romanticism. The initial tendency to revive the old dogmatic system rather than develop a new theology was merely the religious manifestation of the current European desire to forget the tragic years of revolution and bloodshed. There were in all three countries a few men, and they gained strength with the years, who refused to abdicate their intellects and who attempted to develop their theological systems in accordance with the general advance of thought. They declined to surrender the conquests of scholarship and culture. The line of theological reaction had thus always to contend, in the upper-class religious revival, with the thrust of progress. The most important exponents of reaction were the Swedish pastor Henrik Schartau, the Danish Grundtvig, and the Norwegians Wexels, C. P. Caspari and Gisle Johnsen; progress was represented by the Swedish bishops C. D. af Wingård and Henrik Thomander, and by the Danish theologian H. N. Clausen.

The Swedish pastor, Henrik Schartau (1757-1825), exercised a potent influence which was all the more remarkable in view of his conception of the call. Probably influenced by the Herrnhuters, he experienced a severe religious crisis at the age of twenty. Ordained in 1780, he was attached to the cathedral of his university town, Lund, in 1785, where he spent the remainder of his life. Though closely akin to the pietists and the Herrnhuters, he broke with them because they leaned toward sectarianism and because of certain doctrinal differences. Martin Luther became his model. He remained uncompromisingly loyal to the state church. The duty of a pastor, he held, was to preach the word of God in all its purity and strength, letting its inherent power lay all opponents low.

Polemical preaching he disdained. Despite his loyalty to the institutional church, which he considered divinely ordained, he taught an extremely individualistic Christianity. There was salvation only for the individual soul through the grace of God and the atonement of Christ, which enabled that soul to grasp the faith. An intense, overpowering faith would manifest itself in a sober, ethical life; but right living without that faith was still damnation. The old, blind, institutional orthodoxy he clearly recognized as invalid; but he was equally opposed to neology. In his demand that the Christian must achieve faith himself by the grace of God, and in his insistence that the true faith perforce expresses itself in the good life, he approached the *läsare*, and especially the Haugeans. But he differed sharply from them on the question of lay preaching and on their revivalistic methods. Lay preaching he considered disorderly; if anyone considered himself to be called by God to preach, let him become properly ordained. No artificially stimulated emotionalism could possibly be as efficacious to conversion as the sincere, dignified preaching of God's Word. Neither the Christian pastor, nor the layman, he held, had any "great call" to do great things, but only a "little call" to preach the gospel simply and to be faithful in small things.⁶¹ This message was no exhortation to noteworthy exploits of any kind, but to a quiet life. It is not strange, therefore, that Schartau's followers have always eschewed politics and been consistently loyal to constituted authority.

Schartau did not journey about to preach. He remained in his pulpit at Lund. Despite his loyalty to the Church, he was much disliked by the more progressive Tegnér and Wingård. Wingård respected Schartau but never ceased to warn his pastors against the sin of deifying a mere mortal.⁶² Nevertheless Schartau gradually trained a group of young pastors who distinguished themselves from the rest of the clergy by their earnestness, sobriety and severity. He published almost nothing before his death, but left a body of manuscript which appeared posthumously and found its way into thousands of homes along the south-western coast. The most rapid expansion of his movement also occurred after 1825, coinciding with the popular religious revival. Indeed, for that part of the kingdom it was the popular revival. It was a common saying, when a

Schartaun pastor took over a new congregation, that "now shoe-leather will become expensive," for people trudged great distances to hear them. Often they came from neighboring parishes, and this practice was a source of much jealousy and perturbation on the part of the less saintly clergy.

By remaining within the state church, and especially by training an almost self-perpetuating group of pastors, Schartau helped greatly to improve the Swedish clergy. That there was room for improvement is a commonplace, though it needs to be remembered that the testimony of the revivalists is frequently too lurid. Thomander, in 1826 but an instructor at the University of Lund, wrote a drastic description of the two hundred preachers who that year assembled in convention. They brought their wives and marriageable daughters with them, they were well supplied with veal steaks and other rich foods, but they bought hardly a single book from the recently established Danish book dealer. "What ignorance, servility, selfishness, popishness. Twenty out of one hundred and fifty are good stuff; at least twice as many are unworthy to occupy any kind of an office," he exclaimed.⁶³ Bishop Wingård wrote to von Hartmansdorff in 1831 that revivalistic disorders would probably never occur,

if the older clergy could combine a warm zeal with wise living and knowledge of human nature, and if they were what they ought to be, *teachers and keepers* of souls. It is no wonder that the congregation runs off with the enchanting assistant pastor [probably a young Schartaun]—for it is youth which revolutionizes the world—when the regular pastor preaches seldom or superficially and pays more attention to his cheeses and his hams than to the souls with which he is entrusted.⁶⁴

As a bishop, Tegnér was so disgusted with the intellectual and moral depravity of the clergy and so discouraged by his failure to improve them that he would have resigned his office if he could have made a living in another occupation.⁶⁵ Intemperance was a prevailing vice, gambling was common, vanity almost universal. Extortions were practiced upon the laity. Almost no pastors studied. Not even the statistical and administrative work of the pastors was done as well around 1830 as in the preceding century.⁶⁶ Their sex habits were frequently loose, although it might be urged in excuse that their mar-

riages were unhappy, since they were often practically forced to marry the predecessor's widow. It was often the only way a young man could secure a living, for the parishes were reluctant to pay the widow and her children the required pension, and made the call contingent upon the union of the young man with the usually much older widow.⁶⁷

Where Schartau's movement established itself, all this was changed. Both the clergy and the laity who experienced his influence began to live more virtuously. Bohuslän, formerly a cesspool of iniquity, was transformed after 1820 into one of the most sober and pious provinces in Sweden.⁶⁸ This was not due entirely to Schartaunism, however, for the herring fisheries, always the core of Bohuslän's moral corruption, had ceased in 1808. Nor were the Swedish bishops entirely without credit for some of the improvement. Bishop Wingård, for example, constantly admonished the clergy in his instructions, private correspondence and visitation; he bluntly denounced some of them as *suparpräster* (drunken preachers).⁶⁹ He deplored many features of both the popular revival and the Schartau movement; some of the leaders he vigorously attacked as mere racketeers. Yet he was broadminded enough to send some of the Schartaun preachers into "dark and cold regions . . . to stir things up, a result which, to the discomfiture of frivolity and indifference, has not failed to develop."⁷⁰ He willingly admitted the moral regeneration which attended the revivals, and declined to persecute them.

In spite of these influences, however, Swedish churchmen until 1865 were more worldly than those of either Norway or Denmark. The fact that they formed a political estate in the *riksdag*, with definite upper-class interests, often at variance with those of the peasantry and the burghers, militated heavily against their acceptance of such a self-denying code as Schartau's. As a group, they therefore remained, until long after 1865, apart from the mass of the people, and gave rise to widespread suspicion and contempt. They clung to their increasingly unnatural privileges with a tenacity exceeded by no other group. Even the nobility obeyed the handwriting on the wall earlier than the clergy by voting to abolish itself in favor of the generally elected, two chamber system of representation.⁷¹

In Denmark the theological reaction centered about Nicolai

Frederik Severin Grundtvig (1783-1872) and Bishop J. P. Mynster (1775-1854). Of these Grundtvig was incomparably the more important. As a young man he received the best education that his country could afford, and his life sprang from the best culture of his day. He drank deeply of the philosophy of Fichte and Schelling. Goethe, Schiller and Shakespeare were among his favorite authors. He himself was a many-sided genius. No contemporary made more important contributions to a knowledge of Old Norse and Anglo-Saxon literature. His poetry sometimes attained sublimity. He became the soul of Danish nationalism, and laid the groundwork for the democratic Party of the Left. His ideas of education have had revolutionary significance, not only in Denmark, but abroad. None of this work did he personally consider of equal importance with his religious mission. Nevertheless, all was inseparably intertwined.

Grundtvig belonged to the group inspired by Henrik Steffens in 1802. His study of theology was uneventful until 1810, when upon reading Kotzebue's account of the conquest of Prussia by the Teutonic Knights under the sign of "the withered cross", he slammed the volume shut in anger at the phrase, and "sprang up as if seized by a mighty spirit which called me to lead a reformation."⁷² On March 10, the same year, he preached his trial sermon, which bitterly attacked rationalism. In one sentence he sounded the keynote of the coming decades:

Our age stands at a turning point, perhaps one of the most important in history; the old has disappeared, the new staggers unsteadily, there is no one to reveal the mysteries of the future; where, then, should we find rest for our souls but in that Word which shall endure when heaven and earth are fused and the universe is rolled up as a garment.⁷³

The clergy turned upon him and had him publicly reprimanded by the Rector Magnificus for having "revealed a vain desire for attention." This episode inaugurated a protracted warfare against rationalism in which Grundtvig championed biblical Lutheranism. His manner was overbearing, provocative, even impudent. Good friends were alienated, and it was next to impossible for him to find a pulpit in Copenhagen. The dark years, 1813 and 1814, when Denmark was threatened by the invading armies of Bernadotte, aroused Grundtvig to a

flaming patriotism. He applied the Book of Revelation to Denmark, assuring his countrymen that here was the little group that God has chosen for His own. But it was of no use, he told the student volunteers, to offer their services to the king unless they had the true faith, for if there were no God the heaviest battalions would win, and if there were a God how could victory attend the banners of those who did not trust in Him? As a result of his representations forty students joined him in offering their lives to the nation in holy brotherhood.⁷⁴

So began Grundtvig's identification of religion and patriotism. The years between 1814 and 1821 he spent mostly in study of ancient Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. But this he considered a "winter occupation", and it was with renewed zeal, though greater maturity, that he resumed his religious activity. His studies had not been without significance to that work, however, for he now began to transmute his admiration for the ancient pagan heroism to Christianity, demanding that the Christian culture of his own day adopt the fearlessness, the passion for achievement, which marked the viking ancestors. To take the red light of the Old Norse camp fires and transform it into the sweet sunlight of the Christian religion was a feat that required all of Grundtvig's prismatic and romantic imagination, although Geijer, inspired by Fichte, did almost the same in Sweden. Strife, Valhalla, and valkyries became symbolical of the struggle between good and evil. The old Germanic virtues of blood and battle were grafted upon the rose-tree of Christian submissiveness. The resulting flower was not so much a religion tinged with patriotism as a patriotism tinged with religion. Grundtvig wished to inspire his people, first to the conquest of God and then to the battle for a better material future for Scandinavia.⁷⁵ He expressed his objective succinctly in the preface to his poem *Nytaarsmorgen* (*New Years Morning*) in 1824:

Now I earnestly long for a small circle of friendly co-laborers who, ignoring the witch, will depend upon the Lord and keep steadily before them the great goal He surely wishes us to attain: *the revival of Scandinavian heroism to Christian achievements, in line with the demands and conditions of our time.*⁷⁶

Fantastic as this combination of ideals may appear, it had important consequences in all three countries. It inspired

Grundtvig's followers, especially the folk high school people to idealize practical work, to view all new developments boldly and fearlessly, and to exercise that pioneering enterprise which constitutes the most valuable contribution of capitalism.⁷⁷ This became more evident in the period after 1865, than before.

The religious patriotism of which Grundtvig thus became the great exponent had a broad social base. The fellowship he sought was as wide as humanity, but he thought primarily of Denmark and the closely related Scandinavian countries. Until about 1825, Grundtvig's message was restricted to a few of the elite in Copenhagen. But there he found himself thrust outside an impregnable wall of disdain. His breach with J. L. Heiberg, the arbiter of good taste in the capital, with H. N. Clausen, the exponent of learned theology, with Oehlschläger, the highpriest of the literary cult, and with the Ørsted brothers, who led the scientific phalanx, practically deprived him of standing. For a brief period he and some of his friends contemplated open secession from the state church.⁷⁸ Eventually he was compelled to seek his following in the rural districts. His own inner development drew him to the same course. Preoccupied with Scandinavian mythology and folklore, and driven by the historian's sense of the continuity of all things, he arrived at the conclusion that the vitality of any civilization depended upon the human mass on which it rested. His call for an heroic Christianity was directed not to Nietzschean supermen, but to the rank and file. It was this growing democratic sense which now brought him into some harmony with the lay revivalism of "the godly." He still avoided their meetings because he disliked their pharisaical tendencies.

Church history has taught me that the type of sickly pietism usually found in such assemblies very easily mates with crack-brained notions, contempt for the teaching profession and eventually for Scripture itself...⁷⁹

But now he began to view the lay revival as the religious reassertion of that folk-spirit which he was coming to regard as the true fountain head of the social order. "The godly", on their side, were charmed by many of his writings, especially

his hymns. Thus there occurred a gradual assimilation, promoted by Jakob Christian Lindberg, editor of *Nordisk Kirketidende*, the unofficial organ of "the godly." Grundtvig's feud with H. N. Clausen and the intelligentsia,⁸⁰ began, about 1832, to spread to the country districts. It occasioned a sharp local controversy on the Holsteinborg estate, where the school-teacher Rasmus Sørensen, soon to become a prominent peasant politician, defended Grundtvig. In 1838, Grundtvig and Lindberg proposed to the Roskilde Estates that the congregations be emancipated from the episcopal system in choosing pastors, and that the pastors be free to preach as their consciences might dictate. By a combination of conservatives and urban liberals this measure was decisively defeated.⁸¹ But when Grundtvig was thus, so-to-speak, driven out of Copenhagen into the country, the basis was laid for the essentially rural character of his movement, something which was destined to have much the same political effect as the rural popular revivals in Norway and Sweden.

The arch of the Grundtvig system was capped when he came to the "matchless discovery" that the essence of the Christian religion is to be found in the Apostolic Confession, and not in the other parts of the Bible.⁸² All his earlier work was based on the thesis that the whole Bible was divinely inspired and that all its parts were equally important. More and more, however, he approached the position of Lessing. He could see that historically Christianity had passed through a period of development, that each generation contributed the highest interpretation of religion which it could attain. Christianity thus conceived became a body of tradition, closely akin to mythology and folklore, the expression of the "folk-spirit." The Apostolic Confession seemed to him the one permanent element about which the web of tradition was spun; therefore it became to him the "living word." Away with all theological sophistries, he cried, and back to the simplicity of Jesus, as expressed in the Confession and in baptism. From that moment Grundtvig abandoned theology, concentrating instead on practical ethics. Thus he achieved, at least to his own satisfaction, that unity of viewpoints which romanticism postulated as essential. History was a unity. The Viking Age still possessed validity for contemporary society. Civilization was the work-

manship of the masses. True religion was developed by the people if they were free. All human institutions were creatures of the people, even the state. To adapt institutions to contemporary requirements, the people must be educated to an understanding of its past and its present, and must enjoy the greatest degree of self expression. When he finally arrived at this point, Grundtvig had a social philosophy based upon history and religion, which championed nationalism and democracy, and was directed toward the highest ideals of middle class capitalism.⁸³

Rejected and scorned at first, Grundtvig gradually gathered a group of friends who recognized him as a prophet. From his pen flowed a constant stream of literature to an always widening circle of readers. In all parts of the kingdom he had close personal friends with whom he maintained an active correspondence. At length he was able to persuade the authorities to allot the Frederick Church in Copenhagen to the use of a free congregation without the right to administer the sacraments. Late in the 1830's Grundtvig's struggle with the opposition was clearly won. His active work to persevere Danish nationalism in the duchy of Schleswig and his espousal of the democratic cause in the Roskilde Estates caused the National Liberal leader Orla Lehmann to refer to him as "one of the few men in Denmark." Church struggles were abating and political controversies were absorbing more and more interest. A series of historical lectures that Grundtvig was invited to deliver at Borch's Collegium in Copenhagen in 1839 were well attended.⁸⁴ In 1838, Bishop Mynster refused him permission to confirm his own sons, on the ground that he was not a clergyman of the official church, but the following year consented reluctantly to Grundtvig's appointment by the King as regular pastor in Vartov. There he worked to change the state church into a free "people's church." His influence increased as Mynster's declined. By 1849, his following was so large that the Constitutional Assembly adopted his favorite name for the state church, *The People's Church (Folkekirken)*. With King Christian VIII and the queen he was on intimate terms. Finally, in recognition of his work as a religious leader, he was constituted titular Bishop.

No man has had a more profound influence upon Danish

culture. After his death he became an almost mythological figure.

For, by his worship of the people and the popular, Grundtvig has become the saint of democracy. It may with propriety be said that the Left Party movement has its roots in him. The *faith in the people* which lies back of this colossal development as its essential sustaining and propelling force,—that has been taken from Grundtvig. From the high schools as centers it has branched out and has extended to all the many and varied enterprises—material as well as spiritual—which have been the fruit of the awakening popular need for independence and activity. For all sorts of enterprises, from high schools and agricultural institutes to cooperative creameries and hog abattoirs, fruit-growers' and export societies, Grundtvig has been the patron saint. And just as surely as every enterprise begun in the genuine democratic spirit,—whether it were a bank or a newspaper—, always included in its name the word "people's" [*folkelig*] as a guarantee of its authenticity, just as certain it was that when it should name its saint it would refer to Grundtvig, among other reasons as proof that it was not committed to mere materialism, but willingly submitted to the demands of the spirit and, briefly, that "it was in compact with the higher authorities"... And if the object might be emancipation from ancient authority or ancient prejudice, then too it was Grundtvig to whom the appeal was made. From him was taken the great gospel of freedom, which gave to everyone the right to do somewhat as he pleased, and which especially in all personal and spiritual relationships opened the door to the fullest degree of individualism... This gospel of freedom expressed self-determination, which is a basic characteristic of the age itself, which constitutes the very life nerve of democracy, which has expressed itself concretely in the steadily growing self-government of the people, as well in the political sphere as in that of church and school and in private economic enterprise.⁸⁵

Not even in the beginning when he was biblically orthodox, did Grundtvig enjoy the wholehearted sympathy and support of J. P. Mynster. Mynster also worked hard for a return to genuine Lutheranism; but he remained an intimate member of the most cultured, intellectual, and aristocratic circle in Denmark, and became the founder of the High Church party. As a boy he had grown up in the household of Count Goske Moltke, one of the first families of the realm, where he acquired a polished, severe manner which enhanced his native oratorical ability. He began his career as a pastor in Copenhagen in 1812, and the breach between him and the volcanic Grundtvig began at once, when the latter offended him by

demanding that he come out openly against unbelief and rationalism.⁸⁶ But violent polemic was not Mynster's method. He preferred to work quietly, bringing his influence to bear as he grew in stature. Rationalism he opposed, but he also recognized that it was too firmly rooted to be overthrown in a day. On the occasion of the Lutheran tercentenary in 1817, the Danish bishops signalized the reformation as the inauguration of the liberal interpretation of Scripture, and as late as 1833 Rev. K. O. Knutzen heard good practical sermons in the truest vein of the enlightenment being preached to the Danish peasantry.⁸⁷ The power of his personality was quickly recognized, and his elevation to the bishopric of Zealand, the primacy of the official church, naturally followed. Although he disliked Grundtvig personally and staunchly opposed the Grundtvig-Lindberg proposal of 1838, both men, each in his way, strove to revive a personal Christianity.⁸⁸

The Norwegian clergy, never deeply infected with rationalism, made the transition gradually and with little commotion. The only sharp controversy occurred in 1828, when Professor Treschow published a rationalistic treatise on the spirit of Christianity.⁸⁹ He was immediately assailed by the young follower of Grundtvig, the reverend Wilh. Andr. Wexels, pastor of Our Saviors Church in Oslo.⁹⁰ This controversy was almost identical with the Clausen-Grundtvig feud waged in Copenhagen three years earlier, and there is every evidence that Wexels consciously conducted it in the same manner. Treschow was certainly one of the most deeply religious men in the Scandinavian countries, but decidedly unorthodox in his liberal interpretation of the Bible. In his long career as teacher and professor of philosophy, both at the University of Copenhagen and at the University of Oslo, he had placed the stamp of his influence upon many of the most important men in both countries, and of these Clausen was one. Wexels' chief points of attack were that Treschow considered Christ merely another philosopher and not the divine savior of the world and that he denied the divine inspiration of the Bible. In the following passage he sounded the keynote of the religious reaction:

If he [Treschow] or anyone else should now require that I produce *proof* of my contention that the Bible must be taken at its word and

remain its own interpreter, then I must in the first place admit that this appears to me to be very peculiar. For is not the New Testament an *historical* book by *reliable* authors? And is there any *reliable historical writer* who does not have the right to demand himself believed upon his word and understood, not by dim and indefinite interpretations, but by his own clear and precise account? And who has ever heard, that a reliable writer of history must prove to the critical mind of his reader that those events have happened which, as eye-witness or specialist, he simply and directly relates?⁹¹

To the great mass of the Norwegian people this argument was sufficient. There were a few, like Henrik Wergeland and his father Nicolai, who stood staunchly with Treschow, but most of the small groups of scientifically minded people in the little country were merely indifferent. Nicolai Wergeland confided his disgust to his notebook, where he wrote that the scientist is applauded on a new discovery, "But if anyone thinks himself to have revealed a new truth in the realm of theology, then it is no truth, or if it is a truth, then it is still heresy, a heretical truth, or a true heresy, which lay and learned condemn."⁹²

Wexels won this battle, but eventually himself fell victim to the forces of orthodoxy. The trouble was that he followed his master, Grundtvig, into a position considerably at variance with the strictly Lutheran doctrine. He failed in 1848 to get the Grundtvigian church historian Ludvig Helveg appointed to the theological faculty. The man who won the appointment was the German, Dr. C. P. Caspari. When, the following year, Gisle Johnson also joined that faculty, the two men who for almost fifty years were to direct the education of the Norwegian clergy had achieved the ascendancy. Both were exponents of the most extreme form of German Lutheran orthodoxy. Against Grundtvig and his influence they waged a constant, successful struggle. The Hauge people found the Caspari-Johnsen tendency reasonably satisfactory; only the most extreme elements revolted against their moderately high-church attitudes.⁹³

The progressive theological line, which might also be called the cosmopolitan line, had almost no representatives in Norway in this period, and but a few in Sweden and Denmark. Such as there were seldom showed any genius and seldom engaged in public controversy. They were university professors, and

their influence was usually felt directly only by their students. Invariably these churchmen possessed outstanding culture. It was impossible for them to accept the narrow doctrinal confines of either the lower-class religious revival or the upper-class religious reversion. They agreed with both of the other tendencies in insisting upon emotional sincerity, but they also insisted upon intellectual sincerity. Hence they refused to ignore the findings of science in other fields of learning; they would not dismiss rationalism as mere error; and they could not be satisfied with a purely national theology. In common with other cultivated people of their time, these churchmen were imbued with a profound historical sense, which when applied to religious problems expressed itself in terms of ideological and institutional evolution, comprehensible only by reason and not by the orthodox conception of revelation. The outstanding Swedish representative of this tendency, Bishop Thomander, characterized it very well when, in presenting one of his books to the leading Danish representative, H. N. Clausen, he termed him "the friend of the Bible and reason."⁹⁴

Johan Henrik Thomander studied at Lund, where he became an enthusiastic romanticist. He learned from Tegnér to respect the liberalism of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic period, and to view them in the light of their historical importance. When eventually himself elected to the *riksdag* he championed political liberalism. A voracious reader of all kinds of literature, from Shakespeare to Schleiermacher, he assimilated it into his theology, and communicated it to his students. In his thought, his politics, and in the administration of his diocese, he was guided, not by any absolute authority, but by common sense. Though he disliked the excesses of the popular revival, he was realistic enough to make room within the state church for the tendency that it represented.⁹⁵

H. N. Clausen's personality was less buoyant than Thomander's, but his position was similar. His never-ending feud with Grundtvig forced him to define his thought more sharply. The son of the reverend H. G. Clausen, one of the most dominating personalities among the Danish clergy, he imbibed the best intellectual elements of the enlightenment. As a student in Berlin, he became a fervent admirer of Schleiermacher. He was thus able to appreciate the best in both the old and the

new. Against Grundtvig's furious assault, he defended rationalism as a necessary historical development. It was by no means, he said,

the result of unqualified unbelief and agnosticism; it arose in protest against the petrifying influence of the orthodox faith in authority, and, with all its one-sidedness and narrowmindedness, it has had its important place in the history of the church of Christ...⁹⁶

His own objective in the study of theology was to emphasize the ethical side of the Christian ideal, which by too much metaphysical speculation had been largely lost.⁹⁷ Christianity needed to be brought back into relation with real life. Clausen's colleague and successor, H. L. Martensen's great work *Den Christelige Ethik* was the most notable contribution to this end, but Clausen raised up the ideal. This objective, Clausen held, could not be advanced by merely hoisting the banner of faith in the manner of Grundtvig, especially faith in the system that Grundtvig advocated, which seemed to Clausen to be based on nothing but sheer obscurantism.

The feud began in 1825, when Clausen published what he considered a strictly scientific study in the history of Christianity.⁹⁸ This book was certainly unorthodox; especially did it seem to ignore the requirement of personal faith. Grundtvig attacked the author passionately in a treatise, which he took five days to write, *The Retort of the Church* (*Kirkens Gemæle*). The episode occurred precisely when Grundtvig and "the godly" were beginning to find one another, a coincidence which, together with Grundtvig's public scorn for the natural sciences, aroused the academic and cultured circles to fear an impending avalanche of plebeian ignorance and reaction. Grundtvig demanded that Clausen be dismissed; Clausen countered with a suit for libel and won it. For twelve years thereafter Grundtvig had to submit to censorship. Another consequence of the incident was that the great jurist, A. S. Ørsted had to give up his authorship. He had demonstrated in an article that Clausen's demand for pastoral freedom to interpret the Scriptures did not need to be enacted into law, because it was already law. Grundtvig declared this position to be in violation of the principle of royal absolutism, and Ørsted's superior, who had long objected to his literary activity,

prevailed upon Frederick VI to silence him. On this occasion Mynster supported Clausen and Örsted against Grundtvig.⁹⁹

The Clausen-Grundtvig feud continued to flare up sporadically for many years. The fact that Grundtvig began to approach his adversary's position from an entirely different direction, demanding freedom for the laity to develop their own religion, did not much allay the antipathy. On the problem of encouraging Danish nationality in Schleswig they were able to cooperate somewhat, but Clausen did not so far trust Grundtvig as to serve with him as trustee of the folk high school in Rödning, in 1855.¹⁰⁰ No doubt personal dislike had something to do with Clausen's attitude. But far more important was his fundamental disagreement with Grundtvig's whole cultural basis. Clausen was an intellectual aristocrat; Grundtvig found his inspiration in the common people. Clausen identified Grundtvig, intellectually as well as politically, with the hated political peasantry.¹⁰¹ Though he willingly admitted that Grundtvig's insistence upon free religious forms had saved the Danish church from the word-tyranny of German Lutheran orthodoxy, Clausen ridiculed the idea that little Denmark could set theological standards for the world, or even for herself. Active contact with foreign theological scholarship, progressive revision of theological tenets, Clausen held to be the necessary basis of true religious development.¹⁰²

IV. DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH

The Lutheran reformation had been to a large extent a revolt of the laity against a dominant hierarchy. But in the Scandinavian countries, where Lutheranism from its first establishment was the official religion, and where the pastors therefore were agents of the authoritarian state, the clergy quickly became a new hierarchy. Throughout the eighteenth and far into the nineteenth century, the pastors dominated their parishioners, often in the manner of petty chieftains. Over them presided the Lutheran bishops, the most masterful personalities of a masterful group. It was this lordliness of the clergy and their identity with the bureaucracy, which aroused the antipathy of the peasantry. On the other hand, ever since the reformation, the clergy had resented their complete subordination to the state, that is, to the monarchy. They insisted that they alone could properly pass judgment upon matters of doctrine and

that the church ought, as an institution, to be more independent of civil authorities. The desired degree of independence, however, the ecclesiastical authorities never achieved. Hence their fortunes were closely tied up with the monarchies, the upper middle classes, and the bureaucracy. The march of the liberals and the peasantry toward political power in national and local government seemed to a large section of the clergy to threaten the church with domination by ignorant lower-class elements. They viewed it as an attack upon "intelligence," and such of their own group, like Grundtvig, who gave aid and comfort to the enemy they treated as traitors. Instinctively, and very often with full consciousness, the conservatives in the church denounced the popular revival and the political movement of the peasantry as merely two phases of the same thing, the rebellion of a social class. And they were right. The revivalists and the peasant leaders recognized it themselves. The social struggle which produced democracy in political affairs, a broader viewpoint in social matters, a system of education planned for the public and for practical life, also penetrated the sanctum of the church. There it revolved around the questions of a revised liturgy and church legislation.

The desirability of liturgical revision was clearly realized by the pietists and the rationalists. The former were able to produce acceptable prayer books and hymnaries, because they did not depart far from the stage of religious development attained by the great mass of the people. The rationalists met with unsurmountable opposition, partly because their books represented a degree of cultural development entirely alien to the average parishioner in the rural districts, and partly because they were overwhelmed by a general European reaction. The great mass of Bibles and other religious literature distributed by the bible societies early in the nineteenth century, almost all of it in the archaic language of the unrevised liturgy, froze the language of religion into a relatively fixed form. And that fixity of form prevented the leaders of the church from revising the liturgy without encountering extreme resistance from the side of the revivalist peasantry. The popular revival, it has been said, was a denial by the common people of the clergy's right to determine the content of religion. The revival clung to the old books and the old liturgy as being the "true doc-

trine," and suspected every attempt at revision from above as tainted with "false doctrine." Many of the educated clergy appreciated that an archaic language and liturgy would ultimately result in a deplorable separation of religion from life, and some understood that since an educated clergy must necessarily use a current and not an archaic language the preservation of an archaic religious language and liturgy by the masses must inevitably tend to widen the gulf between the clergy and the laity. In trying to revise the books and the ceremony, they hoped to make them more functional. But at the same time they insisted, as good romanticists, that due regard must be given to esthetic values as understood by the educated classes. The church history of both Sweden and Denmark in this period is highly colored by this contest over the liturgy.¹⁰³

The contest over ecclesiastical legislation was even more definitely marked by social antipathies, for here were involved such questions as the pastor's right to discipline his parishioners by withholding the sacraments, the extent to which the individual layman could be held bound to the church and the pastor of the parish in which he resided, and the right of the laity to a share in the determination of church affairs in each parish. In the course of time a great deal of confusion had, through minor changes, found its way into church legislation, and it was recognized, about 1825-30, that a codification was urgently necessary. But when the peasantry in the parliaments began to take a hand in these matters, the clergy and their upper-class allies hesitated, preferring the status quo if they could not have their own way. The peasantry demanded freedom for the layman to choose his own pastor, even if this should mean the right to cross parish lines; and they wanted parish councils of laymen with real authority even over the pastor. Clergy, bureaucracy, and intelligentsia resisted strenuously this subjection of the pastor to his congregation. It was possible, in 1838, to defeat the Grundtvig-Lindberg proposal in the Roskilde Estates to allow the laity more freedom in church affairs; but at that time the Danish peasantry had hardly begun their political awakening. The Danish constitution adopted in 1849 provided that parliament was to regulate the People's Church, but all efforts to do so in a comprehensive ecclesiastical constitution were doomed to failure; hence the

riksdag, in which the peasantry and the Grundtvig people were gaining power, had the church constantly in its own hands, a situation they were not eager to change. The peasants supported a bill which passed in 1862 over the strenuous opposition of the non-Grundtvig clergy, permitting the layman to go to church wherever he might please.¹⁰⁴ The same group, in 1860-61, unsuccessfully sponsored a piece of practical peasant legislation, which would have deprived the clergy of their glebes, put them on a salaried basis, and thus subjected them to a more rigorous financial control by the *riksdag*.¹⁰⁵

A similar policy with similar results was being pursued in Norway by Ueland and his peasant following, both in provincial assemblies and in the *storting*. Though he wanted a devoted and zealous clergy, capable of exercising real religious leadership, he never admitted for a moment that they ought to exercise dictatorial authority. On the contrary, he was always on the alert to pare down their bureaucratic powers and to promote the development of democracy within the church. He resisted successfully the government plan to place the church under a synod, in which the clergy would preponderate, for he was certain that if such a synod should begin by giving advice to the lawmakers it would conclude by displacing them. The government of the church, he held, and the peasantry agreed with him, must conform to the democracy established in the political sphere. To that end they wanted parish councils, elected preferably by universal suffrage, and equipped with authority to check upon the pastor. Neither the desire of the official clergy for a synod which would take church matters largely out of the hands of the politicians in the *storting*, nor that of the peasantry for parish councils with legislative authority, was fulfilled. Thus the *storting* and the ministry continued to wrangle about ecclesiastical affairs, and out in the parishes the clergy and the common people made such adjustments as they could. But the advantage lay far more with the laity than with the clergy.¹⁰⁶

Only Sweden, where the clergy constituted a separate chamber in the *riksdag*, established a synod to preside over the development of ecclesiastical affairs. This occurred in 1863, two years before the clergy were retired from the political arena.

By 1865 the Scandinavian middle classes had become religiously selfconscious. They had revolted against the aristocracy of the church and had successfully asserted their own right to determine the form and content of their religious life. If at first this popular religion was somewhat rough and uncouth the explanation lay in the comparatively low plane of their general culture, but as that improved so did the religious self-expression of the lower middle classes. And on their way toward a higher plane they were met by an upper middle class religion in retreat from a too advanced, and therefore at that time artificial, stage of development. Almost insensibly these two currents merged to their mutual benefit. The result was such a vital religious life as the Scandinavian countries had never known since the reformation. The church, as well as economic and political institutions, had been made to conform with the ideals of an individualistic, capitalistic, democratic society.

CHAPTER X

SCANDINAVIAN PHILOSOPHY, 1800-1865

The above mentioned complete materialism had, on the bases of matter and motion (and motion was viewed as intrinsic to matter), conceived of the whole universe, external and internal, as a machine, thus in a sense establishing lifelessness and death as the all-pervading principle of existence. But the living forces thus violently suppressed in conviction had to express themselves somehow; and when exiled from the *intellect* they took refuge in feeling, where they asserted themselves all the more powerfully. In this manner the mortally desiccated materialism gave way to a new transitional system, which animated everything through sentiment and, carried away by this life-giving sentiment, practiced a kind of nature worship. We call this transitional stage esthetic pantheism.¹

The Scandinavian countries have produced almost no philosophers of first rank. If the Swedish Boström and the Danish Kierkegaard be admitted to that great company, the list is exhausted. It would be futile to attempt to explain this fact. The simple observation will have to suffice, that Scandinavians have been content to follow the philosophical currents of the western world, subjecting them to critical analysis, altering them somewhat in detail, and applying them practically. On the other hand it needs to be noted that Scandinavian life has furnished the same basis for the development of philosophy as the rest of Europe. If they have given the world no startling, original, complete system of thought,—no Kant, no Hegel, no Mill—, they may properly claim to have participated creditably in the spade-work. In this respect, too, they have been a part of the advancing army of European civilization and not merely its camp followers.

I. THE RISE OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY

For many years prior to 1781 there had been slowly building up a half conscious resistance to formalistic rationalism.

When this resistance, with the publication in that year of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, became open revolt, the eighteenth century began to be scornfully denounced for narrow, sterile materialism. It is possible now to evaluate it more justly. Rationalism performed a necessary service, and its best representatives were interesting, many-faceted personalities. Its fundamental error was very human; it oversimplified life. The discovery of law in nature, culminating in Newton's mechanical conception of the universe, was an overpowering intellectual experience, comparable only to the religious experience of conversion. Arithmetic and physics, it was thought, would bring understanding of all life. Variety in human existence, especially its sentimental and psychic aspects, its subtle indefinable beauties were temporarily forgotten under the spell of this tremendous discovery. Everything must be reduced to useful mathematical formulae. Science was imagined to have no limitations. In an inspired passage, Goethe, that great spirit of romanticism, wrote

Wer Grosses will, muss sich zusammenraffen;
In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister,
Und das Gesetz nur kann uns Freiheit geben.²

Herein he transcended both rationalist and romanticist. Science and Faith have equally their limitations.

It was the function of romanticism to re-establish what the Age of Reason had ignored. Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* furnished the intellectual basis upon which that might be done. The cloistered, introspective Königsberger, analyzing the problem of cognition, pointed out that man himself is an imperfect, distinctly limited instrument of perception, who therefore cannot know his world solely by scientific observation. But what other avenues are there to an understanding of the universe, of God? Well, those other, no less real experiences,—emotion, sense of beauty, conscience, faith. Kant himself was no disparager of science: his own conception of God was thoroughly rationalistic; he merely pointed out that science at its existing state of development failed to explain many things and would probably always be limited. To the patient laboratory specialist this was no deterrent; he did not therefore quit his instruments. But other men seized upon Kant's thesis as a declaration of

intellectual liberty. Kant was no exception to the invariable fate of prophets that their lesser disciples distort their truths. His doctrine was interpreted in some quarters to mean that man might believe whatever he pleased. Gradually a basic concept of romanticism developed, namely, that the universe made an essential unity. But how was it possible, without complete knowledge of the universe, to find unity by way of science? Only a few intellects, like Treschow and H. C. Ørsted, accomplished this feat. The rest of the intelligentsia therefore, appealing to Kant, arbitrarily reasserted religion, often in its crassest form, as the unifying principle, to which all else, even science, must be subject. The subjection to authority was offset by an irrational optimism founded upon a belief in good luck as reward for goodness.³

The philosophy of Immanuel Kant was extremely popular in the 1790's, especially in Denmark. Only a few understood it, but the essential ideas on the validity of faith, form and matter, and duty became catch-words. There were a few ultra-radicals who used his admission that the existence of God is unprovable to deny the Supreme Being, but far more commonly Kant was celebrated as the founder of a rational religion and as the prophet of a new, stern morality.⁴ After Kant had revealed the limitations of science, there came to Copenhagen in 1803 the young Norwegian-born Henrik Steffens. In Germany he had imbibed the full draught of romanticist ideology, especially as Schelling taught it. In an epoch-making series of lectures he laid down the bases of the new thought. It was necessary, he declared, to seek the essential unity of all things; facts and details are important, but more important is the whole of which they are but parts, and which gives them meaning. Nature he described as the product of mysterious forces by way of evolution; he dealt with it half as scientist and half as poet. He viewed history as a process, not as a fortuitous series of events. Above all, however, he stressed the unity of nature's plan, and deplored the tendency toward specialization of work as between scientists, artists, and religious leaders.⁵ In his audience were several of the future leaders of Scandinavian thought, who have all testified to the profound impression which Steffens made. Thereafter Schelling,

Schleiermacher, Fichte, and Hegel were widely read and followed.

Between the philosophies of Kant and Steffens and those of some who followed them into the fold of romanticism there were tremendous differences. Neither of the former despised the sciences. But when the romanticist plea for the recognition of spiritual values degenerated into biblical orthodoxy, the sciences were often undervalued. Thus Grundtvig, when he wrote his *World Chronicle* (*Verdens krønike*) in 1812, paraphrased Genesis and other parts of the Old Testament into the first half of the first chapter. If a Christian writes history, he declared, he must write it according to the Bible.⁶ And in 1814 he wrote:

I am not an astronomer, but as a theologian I find reason to believe, as is actually written in the Bible, that the sun moves, and if I am once sure of that then all the astronomers in the world will never make me believe anything else.⁷

Grundtvig's demand, in the *World Chronicle*, that science bow to revelation, was categorically refused by the historian Chr. Molbech and the physicist H. C. Ørsted. The latter wrote from Paris to his brother A. S. Ørsted, February 25, 1813, that "This person's enmity for reason has long made me disposed to take hold of him. Nevertheless, I would rather see him fall into your hands."⁸ Fortunately for Danish intellectual development, Grundtvig himself continued all his life to learn and to change his convictions, so that in a series of lectures delivered in 1843-1844 he championed a realistic philosophy based upon experience, such as the English had developed. He thought in public, writing what happened to be uppermost in his mind at the moment, and hence he often appeared to contradict himself. To romantic ideals, however, he was always loyal,—to its passion for unity and its emphasis upon the immaterial.

Bishop Mynster, although more moderate in expression than Grundtvig, was more restricted in thought. He insisted on the unity of truth, and denied that truth could be in conflict with all human reason. He would therefore leave science free to pursue research, but when its conclusions contradicted Christian doctrine, then either the Scriptures were incorrectly interpreted or science had failed to penetrate to the fullness of truth.

Meanwhile, science should be sober, restrained, and clear.⁹ Philosophy Mynster viewed as an essentially speculative exercise of no intrinsic value since revelation must constitute the test of its validity. He appreciated it as a mark of gentility, but contended that the Christian could not entertain philosophical opinions at variance with Christian teaching.¹⁰

The grandiose system of Hegel found Scandinavian supporters rather slowly. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) postulated, like other German thinkers in his day, that everything is in flux. The force and law imminent in this flux, and according to which it occurs, is absolute REASON. If human reason would attain to and understand absolute reason, it must be free, unrestrained, that is, unencumbered by prejudices and preconceptions; it must simply be passive mind in which absolute reason may assert itself. If absolute reason, of which human reason is a fragment, be creative, then the science of reason, or logic, is the truest and most fundamental of all sciences, and the one to be followed first. It was Hegel's conviction that evolution takes place in the realm of idea and then expresses the idea in the material. Thus abstract thought, and not observation, becomes the test of truth. Furthermore, in Hegel's system, the detail could only be understood in terms of its place in the whole; its relation to some immediately preceding cause was not enough. Absolute reason is totality. Only by seeing the whole, of which each detail is a part, therefore, can we arrive at any truth about the detail. Hegel was a rationalist, but a speculative rationalist. His disciples soon divided themselves into two divergent groups, the one continuing the master's ideological conception of the universe, a conception which fitted well into the romanticist pattern, the other, culminating in Strauss, Feuerbach, Engels and Marx, turned toward a materialistic conception of the universe while retaining Hegel's dialectical theory.

It was the literary critic, J. L. Heiberg, who introduced Hegelianism into Denmark. In a letter to H. C. Ørsted in 1825, written from Kiel, Heiberg expresses his admiration. He could not imagine that philosophy could develop much farther, "for everything may be found in his system, and not the least thing is lacking."¹¹ Heiberg's own application of Hegelianism was notable in the realm of esthetics, but the

whole system, both its idealistic spirit and its dialectical method satisfied his personal penchant for perfection of form, and he wrote several elaborations of the Hegelian philosophy applicable in other spheres. The outstanding theological representative of Hegel in Denmark was Hans Lassen Martensen, later Bishop of Zealand. For a time Poul Möller taught Hegelian philosophy, from 1827 to 1831 at the University in Oslo, thereafter, until he began to find it inadequate, at the University of Copenhagen.¹² In Denmark this idealistic viewpoint dominated most of the cultivated Copenhagen circle and the official church until the eighteen forties, when Kierkegaard vigorously assailed it.

Norway, in the first half of the century, had almost no professional philosophers. Treschow left the university for public service in 1814; Poul Möller taught Hegelianism between 1827 and 1831; but thereafter it was not until the appointment of M. J. Monrad in 1851, and G. V. Lyng in 1858, that university students were guided by specialists. Nor was there, after Treschow's last work, published in 1831-32, any genuine philosophical authorship in Norway. The literary feud between Wergeland and Welhaven, the economic and legal writings of Schweigaard and Stang, produced some philosophical fragments, but Monrad's *Twelve Lectures on Beauty* (1859) was the first frankly philosophical work to make its appearance after the so-called "dead era." With Monrad the most academic, most completely idealistic, most rigidly conservative brand of Hegelianism dominated the University. It allied itself with the orthodox church to stifle every liberal idea. In neither Norway nor Denmark did the Hegelian system produce liberal, to say nothing of radical, thought. And because it lasted so long, in Norway until 1897, almost every new movement from esthetics to politics had to fight its tyranny, a struggle which goes far to explain the ultra-materialism of modern Norwegian thought.¹³

Sweden was somewhat less affected by the Hegelian system. This was due, not to ignorance or lack of affinity, but to the fact that she was developing an independent, national, speculative philosophy. As finally formulated by K. J. Boström, after whom it is named, it was quite as independent of science and psychology as either Danish or Norwegian Hegelianism.

To both systems, *thought*—the Swedish philosophers preferred to speak of personality—alone has genuine reality. All outward life and form is but the imperfect reflection of God, the perfect spirit. Both therefore were able to support a transcendental pantheism as well as Christian orthodoxy. Both were marked by respect for history and tradition, especially in ideals and law. And both found universal unity, or cohesion, in spiritual, rather than in natural law.

Characteristic of the Boström system was its use chiefly of native Swedish materials. It owed little to rationalism, but something to eighteenth century upper-class mysticism. Linné's *Philosophia botanica* (1751), which transfers to the purely speculative sphere the scientist's orderly method was the first link in the chain. Swedenborg's dualism of spirit and matter, but particularly the mounting tide of Neo-Platonism in the eighteenth century, which seems to have stemmed from Lord Shaftesbury and which influenced the thought of almost all Swedish intellectuals for several decades after 1790, strengthened the purely speculative character of Swedish philosophy. Kant gained many adherents, and Boethius (1751-1810) who professed an ethical doctrine of the harmony of all things, was one of his disciples. Thomas Thorild, the most significant precursor of Swedish romanticism, reveals the influence of Leibniz, Shaftesbury, Pope, and Marcus Aurelius; but his chief mentor was Spinoza, from whom he derived his doctrine of the relativity of good and evil. In Thorild evil disappears in the harmony of the whole. Another important predecessor of Geijer and Boström was the Upsala professor Benjamin Höijer (1767-1812). He taught during the stormy years of the French Revolution, the Swedish Revolution of 1809, and the Napoleonic era, and philosophically justified the youthful academic radicalism of the day. He strengthened the systematic structure of Swedish thought, and postulated that the known world is but a product of the absolute. But he allowed a degree of relativity between the limited and the absolute, because he admitted the possibility of change even in the latter. The true speculative philosophers therefore found Höijer's system unsatisfactory. If the absolute may change, then not even the absolute can have any firm foundation, and no *a priori* assumption can have any validity.¹⁴ This concep-

tion was important in effectually preventing Swedish philosophy from becoming, as Hegelianism did in Norway and Denmark, the implement only of political and social conservatism. Höijer himself was a radical; Geijer began as a political conservative and ended as one of the foremost champions of radicalism; Boström remained a political conservative, but was liberal in religion.

Höijer and Erik Gustav Geijer, of the whole line of Swedish philosophers, stood in the closest relation to the German idealistic school. Geijer was influenced by Kant, but was more in tune with Schiller and Schelling. Hegel's dogmatism, however, he was too vigorously independent to accept. Höijer was more important to him than Hegel. His own life exhibited strongly all the best tendencies of romanticism; in his own country he was one of its founders; but like Grundtvig he kept step with its further development. Geijer's visit to England in 1810-1811 opened his eyes to the defects of the enlightenment. Upon his return he wrote a treatise discussing the value of imagination in moral education. With it he won, for the second time, the gold medal of the Academy of Science. "Rarely, perhaps, has the academic style been so mangled with its own weapons."¹⁵ In common with most of his contemporaries, Geijer rejected the cosmopolitanism of the enlightenment for nineteenth century nationalism. He made history his special study and taught it at Upsala. It was partly due to the influence of Savigny, whose home Geijer often visited in 1825, and partly due to the romanticist respect for tradition that he adopted the views of the "historical school" on society and politics, quickly becoming its leading Swedish representative. He began as a conservative in politics. At the Reformation Jubilee in 1817 he extolled the Holy Alliance as the practical expression of Christianity in sentimental terms that thoroughly disgusted the Hellenistic Tegnér. Nevertheless, he learned constantly. In 1820 he published a study of Thorild which led to a heresy trial, and his acquittal proved his orthodoxy less than it proved the Swedish courts independent of the church. The social problem engrossed him more and more, and gradually he evolved a conception of society and the state which fitted into his speculative philosophy of the finite and the infinite. His starting point was the dignity of the human personality,

a fragmentary revelation of an absolute, divine personality. From this premise he could only draw the conclusion that the individual in whom the absolute revealed itself was worthy of full and equal membership in the state (democracy) and worthy of complete social justice. He announced this change of viewpoint in 1838 and the conservatives branded it "Geijer's apostacy." But in so fundamentally altering his political position, Geijer felt himself to be true to the best in the historical school, its concept evolution.¹⁶

Perhaps he best stated the Swedish philosophy of personality, implying its socially revolutionary potentialities, in the following quotation from an address to the Bible Society in 1836.

Man and humanity are both of the same essence; we live whether we will or no, only in and through one another, the particular in the whole, and the whole in the particular. It is but by this union of all with all that we exist to one another. For only *like* knows *like*. That is so true that we would not even know God if He were not in some measure like us. The beam of His being which we all carry within us is a reflection of the original, eternal, ideal man—man as he is in God. We apprehend the voice of this fellow being or original being, which we all carry within us, in the law of conscience. But the more unselfishly, the more honestly, the more zealously we obey this law, the more it reveals, not only a law maker, but a friend, a helper, a redeemer, who runs to meet our efforts, who strengthens, purifies, and maintains us in the strife. He is not in the church, He is not in any book, nor even in the Bible, if He is not in our own hearts. And *there He is*, as every righteous and conscientious man has himself discovered.

There you have my religion and also my Christianity, for it is the doctrine of a redemption and an active redeemer, which He could not be if He had not condescended to be our equal and dwell with His spirit in the heart of man. We may say that He was compelled to do that. For He has in man produced the *free being*. And since such a being can only be won by love, He has in a sense immersed him in the illimitable ocean of His mercy, in order that He might thus soften his heart, if possible. His pleasure and His honor lies in independence, in freedom, in choice, and *those* honor Him badly, who in Him but fear the mysterious omnipotence on which everything depends. —If this be Christianity, then I am a Christian.¹⁷

After Geijer, it was left for Boström to systematize and further elaborate the philosophy of personality. From 1840 to 1866 he was professor of practical philosophy at Upsala.

Although the tradition of his ascendancy lasted almost until the twentieth century, Boström added little of value. Instead, he laid such emphasis on the reality of spirit and the unreality of matter that his system might have been completed "the day after Plotinus was buried." Furthermore Boström, unlike Höijer and Geijer, refused to admit of any evolution in the absolute. For Boström there was nothing new under the sun. Since the finite is but imperfection, the sciences of the finite can make no contribution to knowledge worthy of the philosopher's attention. Boström thus closed his system to all scientific psychology and built upon a purely *a priori* basis. This was its tremendous weakness, and one which Boström had derived partly from Hegel. But Boström's philosophy was far more flexible in its practical manifestations than the Hegelianism flourishing in the sister countries. Men of the most divergent views on religion, politics, and social problems, nevertheless paid common homage to the ethical principles of Swedish philosophy. Thus, for the cultured groups at least, the social struggle was less bitter and conducted on a somewhat dignified plane.¹⁸

II. THE OPPONENTS OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY

Although the speculative tendency was uppermost in the first half of the nineteenth century, empirical thought, rooted in Locke, Holberg, and Hume, was by no means dead in Denmark and Norway. It resisted romanticism at first, continued for a score of years in an entirely subordinate position, and reasserted itself in the 'fifties and 'sixties with some vigor. The Danish philosopher Boye, defending the state against Rousseau's attacks, argued chiefly from a well developed theory of evolution. Against the conviction that man is fundamentally handicapped in his effort to know the truth, or in theological terms that he is affected with original sin, Boye protested angrily. He opposed Kant in a treatise on "Critical Philosophy and Common Sense" (1803).¹⁹ But the worthiest opponent of the romanticist wave was Niels Treschow (1751-1833). Born in Norway, he was educated at the University of Copenhagen, served first as rector of secondary schools in Norway and Denmark and then as professor of philosophy at Copenhagen. While rector of the school at Elsinore, 1780-1789, he undertook

a careful study of Kantian philosophy, and in the winter of 1796-1797 he delivered a series of lectures in Bernt Anker's library in Oslo, where he attacked various parts of it sharply. At that time he was a thorough-going representative of the enlightenment.²⁰ Treschow, however, was too inquiring and too sensitive to remain impervious to the trends of his time. He never succumbed to pure speculation, but developed an eclectic philosophy peculiar to himself in which Neo-Platonism was an important element. Far too thorough and honest to follow mere fashion, he deeply deplored the tendency of the younger generation to throw overboard the intellectual inheritance of the past in order to accept blindly recent "momentous discoveries." Philosophy he viewed as a progressive development contingent upon the careful use of acquired knowledge.²¹

Two of his last works embodied Treschow's conclusions. His theory of evolution and his justification of individualism are briefly discussed later in this chapter. His eclectic method is clearly apparent.

Without being an adherent of either the Pre-Kantian or the most recent philosophy, I retained from the former a desire for clarity of conception and accuracy in its development, and through the latter my attention was drawn to the illogical in the customary dualism and to the necessity of tracing everything that is real and possible back to a single principle, both in subjective thought and objective reality, something which it had itself, however, vainly attempted.²²

Treschow called his system a "philosophy of identity." The first principle to which he related everything was natural law expressed in evolution.²³ He distinguished three sources of truth: reason, experience and revelation.²⁴ But when his conception of revelation is analyzed it will be discovered that it was very different from the orthodox religious thesis of the literal and divine inspiration of the Bible. The full title of his last and most comprehensive work, translated into English, is, *Concerning God, the World of Ideas and the World of Sensation, and the Revelation of the Two Former in the Latter*.²⁵ Treschow's strongest point was probably his realistic psychology. Only through sensation could reason acquire its materials; therefore every branch of science must come within the philosopher's ken. Höffding summarizes Treschow's psychology thus:

Cause and result cannot be essentially different; one movement can not produce a different kind of movement; if there should seem to be more in the result than can be explained by the cause, *e.g.* perception without movement, then the explanation must be that we have but incompletely and one-sidedly understood the cause...

It was this conception to which Howitz subscribed. It is also basic in Sibbern's psychology, as well as in my own. There is good Danish tradition behind it. Treschow seems at this point to have been influenced by Hartley, as well as by an immediate study of Spinoza; but his own thought has been decisive.²⁰

When Treschow confined himself to epistemology his thinking was not romanticist. It was somewhat otherwise when he ventured into religious philosophy. Here, too, he was independent, and he never abandoned his rationalistic premises, but he was more speculative. Fichte, Schelling, and Schleiermacher influenced him. The work which Wexels so bitterly attacked²⁷ contains Treschow's conclusions on religion. Regarding this book the author "wished, but did not hope" that it might become the basis for religious instruction at the university.²⁸ His interpretation of Christianity, as of all religion, was historical. "Religion, theoretically considered, develops, like the arts, the sciences, and all social institutions, little by little. To properly understand it in its present form we must know all the previous ones."²⁹ Scripture he accepts as divinely inspired, but "it does not follow from this, that everything written by the holy men is perfect in all respects and that it absolutely serves the purpose of the Spirit, nor even that it is free from human error."³⁰ Treschow's God is that of the pantheistic romanticists: "Furthermore, God is everywhere present. With His unlimited activity He fills both heaven and earth."³¹ The doctrine of the trinity he terms a "metaphysical sophistry" with no basis in Scripture.³² The existence of God, creator of all matter, and the existence of good spirits he readily admits, but he thinks the time has come to really deny the devil and all his works, that is to deny his very existence.³³ The biblical story of the creation of woman from the man's rib, Treschow thinks may reasonably mean that "in the most primitive animal condition in which man once lived, the difference between the sexes which later developed . . . was not yet discernible."³⁴ Death Treschow considers, not the wages of sin, but a beneficent natural law. He believes in a physical resurrection, but

not in a fiery Hell; Hell is merely a state of post-lethal dissatisfaction and unhappiness. In the last four chapters, discussing moral philosophy, he denies emphatically that the Christian religion condemns self-interest and pleasure. "Only excess in clothing and ornamentation, dissipation in enjoyment, injustice in business, and oppression of the poor were vices, against which Moses and the prophets as well as Christ and his disciples often waged a struggle."³⁵ Although there were mystical elements in this religion, it was small wonder that to the biblical Lutheran Christians in Norway and Denmark it was virtually atheism. Nevertheless, Treschow appreciably influenced the intellectuals of his day. People as widely apart as Grundtvig and H. C. Ørsted in Denmark and Henrik Wergeland and A. M. Schweigaard in Norway exhibited strong traces of his thought.³⁶

There were other thinkers in Denmark and Norway, especially in the former country, who preserved a staunch independence of the speculative Hegelian tendency. Poul Möller (1794-1838), after a brief period as a disciple of Hegel, evolved a philosophy based solely upon experience. What he disliked in Hegel was the nimble way in which he skipped obstructions; this he considered dishonesty and "affectation." There is a direct line of thought from Treschow, through Möller, to Kierkegaard.³⁷ The physicist, H. C. Ørsted, could never stomach Hegel, however completely he might otherwise be identified with his own romanticist age. Vilhelm Andersen called H. C. Ørsted "a representative of the renaissance, the greatest in this country since Tycho," for in him religion, philosophy and poetry were united.³⁸ He was a harmonious, optimistic, happy personality. When Fredrika Bremer, in 1849, took him to task for his too joyous view of life, he smilingly replied that he would try to improve. "In my happiness over the harmony of the Whole, I shall endeavor to concede pain and sorrow their just rights."³⁹ Like the romanticists he accepted the unity of all things, but he found their common denominator in natural law, particularly in evolution, and he was convinced that a true understanding of the universe could not be achieved by abstract thought, but only through scientific analysis. When J. L. Heiberg wrote to him concerning the perfection of the

Hegelian system Ørsted replied that he would like to study it more closely.

My progress in philosophical literature has stopped with Hegel, because I grew tired of its great vacuity. I am completely convinced that the role of philosophy is but to awaken ideas which are dormant in us; but that makes it the more imperative that he who would perform this function express himself clearly. And when I say "clearly," I also mean "briefly."⁴⁰

Frederik Dreier, a complete materialist, criticized H. C. Ørsted for following the priesthood into dualism. Instead of "spirit and matter," Ørsted began with "energy and matter," and thereupon explained energy as almost synonymous with spirit.⁴¹ There is real foundation for Dreier's caustic denunciation, but few philosophers and few scientists have come to his bold conclusions. H. C. Ørsted preferred to use religious terminology when his philosophy impinged upon religion. He held that God, the creative spirit or energy, manifests Himself in the evolutionary process, and reveals Himself to man in the objective environment. The more fully man understands his physical environment, the more completely he comes into harmony with divine reason, for human reason is a spark of divine reason. "Thus the truths of science progressively approach those of religion, so that they ultimately come into an intimate relation to one another."⁴² He defended the right of the scientist freely to pursue his studies and to accept the conclusions to which they led. Bishop Mynster, a close friend, upbraided him for arriving at results which diverged from the literal statements of the Bible. But Ørsted replied:

Ought we not to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves when we desire another truth than the real one? . . . No, let us honor the truth! With it all that is good is indissolubly united. The complete truth is its own consolation.⁴³

He expressed his disapproval of contemporary poets who romanticized mere legend and superstition as the belief that "anything may occur contrary to the law of nature." "But since nature is the constantly continued activity of eternal reason, superstition is a tendency toward the unreasonable, and therefore but a product of the imagination, which falsely calls itself faith."⁴⁴ Ørsted shared Treschow's respect for the bold thinkers

of the eighteenth century, and essentially also Treschow's conviction that nature, society, and religion were the product of historical development. He was a true representative of his age, wherein he differed from Dreier, in allowing to abstract faith the realm unexplored by science, for example, the question of immortality. His insistence on the indestructibility of energy made him more willing to accept the theological doctrine of a life after this.⁴⁵

In 1824-25 a sharp philosophical controversy in Copenhagen threw into glaring contrast the materialistic determinism of Hume and the speculative thought of romanticism. Oddly enough, it was A. S. Ørsted, the distinguished jurist, who represented the latter. A. S. Ørsted was himself a scientist; he substantially agreed with the views of his brother, H. C. Ørsted; he had no use for mere speculative Hegelianism; but his loyalty to the law placed him in opposition to the empiricist physician, Franz Gothard Howitz (1789-1826). A young woman had committed a crime. Howitz, called by the court to express an opinion upon her sanity, had pronounced her insane. Nevertheless she had been sentenced as a criminal. Howitz then wrote a treatise in Ørsted's *Juridisk Tidsskrift* in which he contended that the woman ought not to have been punished inasmuch as she had acted in the only manner that her sick body permitted her to act. He noted that whereas the physicians in similar cases were disposed to distinguish between degrees of sanity and insanity, the lawyers were prone to stand upon the principle of punishment. He attributed this tendency to their general acceptance of Kant's doctrine on the freedom of the will. Against this doctrine he postulated the physiological, materialistic causes of insanity, and advocated that physicians be called in regularly by the courts to make psychiatric examinations of offenders.⁴⁶

Howitz was immediately assailed by A. S. Ørsted as a rank materialist. He promptly countered with a vigorous attack upon all mysticism and speculation, from Kant through the whole German school to and including Danish camp followers. On the flyleaf he placed the verse from Schiller's *Wallensteins Tod*, which begins, "*Es gibt keinen Zufall.*" Then he presented the essence of Hume's philosophy, buttressed with material from Spinoza, Priestly, Bonnet, Treschow, and Bentham, and

restated his conviction that man is determined in his conduct by the matter of which he is composed, that each individual is different from every other, and hence that broad generalizations of law and philosophy cannot be universally applicable. There are so many gradations between sanity and insanity that it is almost impossible to say when a will is free.⁴⁷ Man is a component part of evolving nature; therefore the sciences, medicine included, are the only safe bases for philosophy.⁴⁸ In his final contribution to the feud, Howitz denied that he was a materialist in the vulgar sense of the term, and complained that A. S. Ørsted and the other opponents,—for he stood almost alone,—had fought him with scorn and not with argument. But he stood stoutly by his convictions.⁴⁹ H. C. Ørsted might write to Heiberg that he did not hold it against Howitz that he thought as he did, that he objected only to his parade of much reading and his schoolmasterly tone;⁵⁰ but in Scandinavian philosophy this professor of medicine ranks with Treschow as a thoughtful man of strong character.⁵¹

Anton Martin Schweigaard, the Norwegian economist, jurist, and statesman, was even more categorical than his master Treschow in denouncing speculation and defending the scientific method. He studied with Poul Möller in Oslo and Copenhagen, and with Friederich Eduard Beneke, the chief opponent of Hegel in Berlin. He despised the facile and priggish *a priori* German school, and he scoffed at its pretentiously cumbersome language. His forceful article, "De la philosophie allemande" was written for *La France Littéraire* in 1835.

The German philosophers equip the soul with an active and creative faculty, which, without entering into any relation to the outer world, without beginning with it, without enriching itself with facts and experience, nevertheless out of itself develops ideas which by a previously contrived harmony correspond to outer reality.⁵²

For himself, he subscribed to the thesis, that "... all perception is subject to qualifications, and that ultimately the basis for the certainty of objective knowledge is the most ordinary result of the most ordinary induction."⁵³ Convinced of the relativity of all knowledge, he was so interested in the particular that he scorned the general. Building philosophical systems was not for Schweigaard; he agreed with his friend Poul Möller that he who constructs a system may find reality at the moment of

its perfection, and it will cease to be real the instant it is committed to paper, for immediately some new fact will be discovered which renders it invalid. This, of course, is empiricism carried to its ultimate degree, the very antithesis of romanticism.⁵⁴ Therefore he could not be a theoretical philosopher. But the extent to which his empiricism dominated all that he did becomes evident from a study of his practical work. He was in general agreement with the *laissez faire* school of economists, but permitted himself many inconsistencies. He developed almost independently, with only some help from A. S. Ørsted, an historical view of Norwegian law, very similar to Savigny's; but his preoccupation with the particular put its stamp upon the study of law in his country so effectively that it has always been weak on the philosophical side. Almost only in esthetics was Schweigaard academic; there he followed Welhaven, and Welhaven followed J. L. Heiberg. In matters of educational policy he was a thorough realist. Unfortunately, Schweigaard ignored theory so completely that his influence on the development of Norwegian philosophy was practically lost. Very few adopted his view.⁵⁵

III. THE IDEA OF EVOLUTION

Reference has frequently been made to the evolutionary theories of several Scandinavian thinkers. No exposition, however brief, of the philosophy of these countries can safely ignore the force of these ideas. Even such pioneers as Christopher Polhem and Carl von Linné had some fanciful notions about an evolutionary process. The former championed a nebular hypothesis of the origin of the earth; the latter was driven by his system of botanical classification to the conclusion that at least within the species a degree of development had occurred. But it was the growing dissatisfaction with a purely mechanistic conception of the universe, about the middle of the eighteenth century, which impelled thoughtful people to favor the more dynamic evolutionary viewpoint. The evolutionary idea itself was, of course, not a new one; but now the sciences began to contribute proof formerly lacking. The great hunger was for some explanation which would justify a belief in cosmic unity. Some, the genuine romanticists, sought that explanation by way of abstract, deductive reasoning; others by way of scien-

tific induction. Treschow gives eloquent expression to this longing:

The mechanistic philosophy affords it [religion] absolutely no foundation. If there exist no other forces in nature than mere movement in space, no other qualities than certain images—dryness, dampness, weight, cold, heat, and what else we are able to apprehend through our exterior senses; if ideas, will, feeling are but the incomprehensible results of a given connection between all the above, then there is nothing divine, nothing which can give us any comfort or protection when our own strength of necessity must succumb to all other powers.⁵⁶

In 1760, the Norwegian Jens Kraft, arrived at an evolutionary conception of society.⁵⁷ At about the same time, Charles Bonnet, in Geneva, revived the theory of man's ascent from lower animal forms, and Buffon began his epochmaking work. From that time forward, the Scandinavian philosophers followed the foreign biologists and geologists closely. Henrik Steffens had read Buffon, Condillac, and Reimarus; Treschow was familiar with Buffon, Maillet, Cuvier, Brogniard, Erasmus Darwin and Sternberg; Olufsen refers particularly to Cuvier; and Dreier to Laplace.

Practically all of the evolutionists were either Danish or Norwegian; the Swedish philosophers were headed in another direction, namely the speculative system that culminated in Boström. The Swedes, of course, did not escape the idea of evolution in history, as pronounced by almost all German philosophers, especially Fichte and Hegel; but the theories of evolution in nature were slow to arouse their interest. In this period, furthermore, Danish and Norwegian intellectual life were practically identical. Tyge Rothe, guided chiefly by Bonnet, Herder and Jacobi, entertained a theory of evolution within the species.⁵⁸ Another Dane, Johannes Boye, went much farther, contending in 1797 that man had arisen from primitive animal forms by a process of survival of the fittest.⁵⁹ In his fourth Copenhagen lecture in 1803 the Norwegian cosmopolitan, Henrik Steffens, though too honest to assign causes or specify particular processes, upheld the theory that flora and fauna, man included, had evolved by separate lines from some common, very primitive form of life. He outlined the evolution of animal life from the lowest jelly forms up through the

corals and polyps, the snails and molluscs, worms, snakes, amphibians, and mammals, to man.⁶⁰

Niels Treschow in 1807 announced a fully developed evolutionary philosophy, which reappears with minor adjustments in all his later works. He began with a nebular hypothesis of the origin of the universe; he explained the formation of solid matter by a process of chemical combinations in solution together with precipitation; he knew that only the more primitive fossils were to be found in the oldest geological strata; like other evolutionists before Lyell he exaggerated the importance of natural cataclysms, but explained them as a result of the shrinkage of the earth's crust and the heat of its interior, not by divine interposition as in the story of Noah; the necessity of adjustment to the new environments caused by the cataclysms produced new and different types of life. Man, Treschow was certain, had descended with other animals from some primitive ancestor closely related to marine life, probably the manatee. He pointed out the similarity between man and the apes, especially the orangoutang, and believed that a complete exploration of Madagascar might produce the missing link.⁶¹ The Swedish botanist, C. A. Agardh, while visiting Copenhagen, wrote to his friend Lorenzo Hammarskiöld, on April 18, 1810, that Treschow had recently conducted a series of lectures on the history of man, "and tried to prove, that man at first was a fish."⁶² Apparently he did not grasp the importance of the theory at that time, though he later adopted it.

The Danish economist and professor, Chr. Olufsen, adhered to the Schelling-Steffens theory, that man like every other natural object "is but the expression of a specific activity, of a special function of the universal organism," but as a scientist he believed that,

The safest path in this labyrinth is the one which leads to the smallest immediate result. We must be satisfied if we are able to discover but a few established points, facts which have been correctly observed, without wishing at once to explain them. In the difficult application of geological observations to geogeny, it looks suspicious promptly to have the explanation at hand.⁶³

Back of this statement was good scientific method. When A. S. Örsted and F. C. Sibbern challenged Howitz's psychological determinism, they did so on the ground that his and Hume's

contention that man is subjected to the same determinants as the animal world would cause all distinction between good and evil to disappear. Howitz's defense, based upon the evolutionary theory, insisted that,

it is the characteristics and their degrees which ennoble, . . . not the laws whereby they are developed. When one says that the polyp moves according to the same law as the lion, he does not therefore deny that they are very different creatures.⁶⁴

To H. C. Ørsted the concept of universal unity was incomprehensible except in terms of an evolutionary process. He was certain that the planets had evolved much as had the earth, and held it reasonable to suppose that life had developed upon them in the same way, and that their life probably exhibited forms similar to those with which man is familiar.

But concerning this earth we know that it has developed through unmeasured time in a series of readjustments, and together with it the flora and fauna. This evolution began with the lowest forms, and moved toward ever more perfect ones, until finally, in the most recent of these periods, that creature was produced in which conscious knowledge revealed itself . . . I am speaking here only of a fact which, so far as man is concerned, is undeniable, and without considering the abstrusities of the researches concerning the manner in which the corporeal and the spiritual are united. Merely to ward off every suspicion of materialism, I wish to refer to the apparent paradox,—apparent because it reconciles itself,—that the same nature, of which man is the undeniable product, must itself be recognized as the product of the eternally creative Spirit, and to the fact that the divine origin of our spirit by no means is contradicted when the facts of nature are admitted. In other words, the concept of the universe is incomplete, unless it is understood as the constantly continued work of the eternally creative Spirit.⁶⁵

It was because Ørsted thus catapulted from the material to the spiritual that Frederik Dreier scornfully spoke of him as a "scientist who smacked of piety."⁶⁶

There were thus, in both Denmark and Norway, advanced thinkers who were able to appreciate and to welcome Darwin's *Origin of the Species* in 1859. The Norwegian journal *Budstikken* reviewed it editorially in 1861, possibly by the editor-in-chief, P. Chr. Asbjørnsen. In conclusion the reviewer predicted that the book would have extremely important results.

The study of the products of civilization will become exceedingly more fruitful; we will endeavor to and be able to throw a light upon the earlier migrations of that which has lived upon our earth, and to meas-

ure the tremendous length of the geological periods of creation by comparison of the earlier with the succeeding organic forms. Physiology will recognize that every capacity and faculty of the mind can only have developed step by step. Concerning the origin and descent of the human race, Darwin is silent, likewise concerning the mutual relations of the human races with one another, but on these points, too, his theory opens up new viewpoints.⁶⁷

In supporting the theory of evolution, these men used practically all the arguments current in their time. Since practically all appealed to geology, and all except H. C. Örsted and Dreier to pre-Lyellite geology the cataclysmic theory looms large. Henrik Steffens and Treschow referred to the fact that embryos in their growth reproduce the stages through which the species supposedly has passed.⁶⁸ Linné and Tyge Rothe assumed that the species had been created separately, and that evolution had occurred within their limits. This was also essentially the position of the good churchman, Bishop J. P. Mynster, who held that God had created all things perfect, but that the Fall had undone His work, so that it had to be reconstructed by a process of evolution.⁶⁹ The others, from Boye down, believed that man and all life had descended from the most primitive forms. In 1822 Olufsen, anticipating natural selection, wrote that there was a larger rhythm in nature, a rise and fall, which produced mutations.⁷⁰ Boye, as early as 1797, definitely stated the theory of the survival of the fittest.

The law of the strongest has prevailed since the beginning of the world, and it prevails everywhere still . . . In the vegetable kingdom we find that the strong everywhere crowd out the weak . . . Also in the animal kingdom the same law of might holds good . . . Whoever here wishes to live must either acquire strength and ever be on guard, or, if he has not the capacity or the sense to do that, must seek shelter and eventually succumb. Thus the corporeal world, in which spiritual qualities apparently have no value, in a sense becomes purified of and protected from the unfit. On this scene we find but completely functional, independent creatures, who frighten away all the lazy and the maladjusted. Nature raises up heroes in order to produce more heroes.⁷¹

Subsequent evolutionists followed similar reasoning.

A philosophy so deeply ingrained must affect all other aspects of thought. It "awakened the three Scandinavian peoples to a new life."⁷² We have seen how it led Howitz and Dreier to a materialist conception of the universe and man.

Treschow and H. C. Ørsted used it to justify a religious view of life. In an age when so many forces operated to enhance the individual's importance, the theory of evolution provided a convenient basis for rationalizing the process. Henrik Steffens, in view of nature's constant differentiations, suggested that the more individualized a particular stage of evolution might be, the more completely it embodied illimitable nature.⁷³ But it was Treschow who developed the theory of evolution into a philosophy of individualism. He presented his views as early as 1807, in what Harald Høffding calls his most remarkable work,⁷⁴ *"Is Any Concept or Any Idea Possible Concerning Particular Things? Answered with Reference to Human Worth and Human Welfare."* Treschow found that in the process of evolution the variant was the supreme current achievement of nature, the point from which future evolution would continue. Therefore the individual human being alone had real existence and the individual human personality supreme value. Seldom has the worth and the dignity of the particular man been better asserted:

From the viewpoint to which we have come in these studies, each human being may be considered as one of the many possible forms which their common nature or idea may assume. Persons are consequently, in the first place, not inconsequential parts of the whole in his particular form. In the second place, we ought not to consider the individuals as many more or less perfect impressions of the same original, of which each would have to be worth as much less as the multitude is greater. For if out of such a multitude only a single copy should remain, there would in a certain sense be little lost by the destruction of the rest. On the other hand, if individuals do not compose merely a number in which all units are equal, then their preservation, so far as their peculiar kind is concerned, can not be less important than that of the species and the genera. We must therefore assume that no individual ever becomes truly extinct, but that death in actuality is but a metamorphosis or a preparation therefor, the beginning and progress of which it is no more permitted us to observe than what takes place in the egg before conception.⁷⁵

This individualism appears again and again in Scandinavian thought. It is most definitely expressed in Norway and Denmark, but the Swedish philosophy of personality is closely akin. Probably its first origin lies in the bitter and often solitary struggle that Scandinavians have always waged against nature. The soil is not rich nor ample, even in Denmark;

forest and mountain have always stood in the way of an easy living; seamanship and fishing have until recently remained highly individualized occupations; even industry preserved much of the character of craftsmanship throughout the nineteenth century. Nietzsche, the arch-individualist of German thought, grew up in Prussian Saxony where the economic configuration greatly resembled that of Scandinavia, and it is interesting to note that the Danish critic, Georg Brandes, was one of the first foreigners to appreciate and popularize his work. Viewed in this light, Treschow is a lofty peak in the Scandinavian mountain chain of individualistic thought. Ludvig Holberg is another; in *Erasmus Montanus* with all its comedy there is an undercurrent of stark tragedy, for though Erasmus alone is right he is overcome by sheer community mass. Holberg's own life and work was the struggle of a sensitive and superior individual against the inertia of a stagnant society. The chain is dominated by such other names as J. S. Sneedorff, A. S. Ørsted, Poul Möller, Henrik Wergeland, F. G. Howitz, F. C. Sibbern, Sören Kierkegaard, Frederik Dreier, A. O. Vinje, Henrik Ibsen, George Brandes, Johan August Strindberg, Sigbjørn Obstfelder, and Knut Hamsun.

Eight years after Treschow formulated his individualistic philosophy and twelve years after Steffens' lectures, A. S. Ørsted published a brief treatise applying this conception to legal theory.⁷⁶ Ørsted refers to Treschow's article as the source of his own thinking.⁷⁷ Since the process of evolution is continually creating divergencies and minute variations, it follows that no classification can be completely accurate or everlasting. Particularly is this true in the field of ethics. Nature consists of a series of individual objects related to one another by infinitesimal gradations. Human reason cannot distinguish these gradations perfectly even in the physical world, for example, the exact difference between psychological disparities, or between good and evil. Every variation has its justification in the law of nature, which is primary reason; how then is it possible to condemn aberrations of behavior?

This constitutes no derogation of the efforts of science to seek the ultimate unity of all moral mandates and to bring the formulas so developed into the closest possible relation to the conditions of individual life. It means only that the goal which the science of ethics thus sets

up for itself, as well as that which is the object of our moral system, is an ideal, the complete achievement of which is forever impossible.⁷⁸

Örsted had no intention of furnishing a brief for license; he meant only to demonstrate scientifically the necessity of humaneness and tolerance.

In all three countries the evolutionary viewpoints, both those inherent in romanticism and those based upon geology and biology, produced new concepts concerning law and the nature of the state. Boye held that all natural and human history exemplified the struggle for existence, the strong always defeating the weak. "All of world history is but the military history of human kind. Nations do not make war in order to establish justice, but to decide which is the strongest."⁷⁹ Hence might is the basis of the state, and the state is nature's instrument in the evolution of man. Quite independently of Savigny's work on German law, Scandinavian students developed somewhat similar historical viewpoints. They did not, however, like Savigny, carry the historical method to its full conclusions. Both A. S. Örsted, who fathered this development in Danish law, and Schweigaard, its outstanding Norwegian exponent, were too much interested in particulars to carry out such a large synthesis. Örsted came to appreciate Savigny's work, but Schweigaard, hostile to German speculative philosophy, overlooked it until well after he had made his own chief contribution. The Norwegian Frederik Stang, at the age of twenty-five in 1833, published an important treatise in the same vein, but independent of the German school. In Sweden, Erik Gustav Geijer, not himself a jurist but a close student of legal history, became the exponent of the historical method and an admirer of Savigny. His view that law and all national institutions were organic developments at first led him like Burke to political conservatism, but ultimately, at the height of the social crisis in 1838, impelled him to join the ranks of the liberals who favored change.⁸⁰

The philosophies of evolution and of individualism produced diverse social theories. The conservative members of the historical school opposed all efforts for reform on the ground that they could only be artificial. A. S. Örsted, in spite of his individualism, was no radical. He was far more liberal in his

younger years, however, than in old age. Schweigaard, on the other hand, though often inconsistent, really practiced his philosophy. But this consisted almost in having none; for, while admitting the reality of an historical evolutionary process, he held that only the concrete and the present can have any reality for us. Thus the individual and the particular situation or problem engrossed his attention. He could therefore advocate the liberation of the individual without becoming academic; when the particular situation seemed to require some other solution, he was still consistent, at least in his own mind. There were others, like the Oslo city physician Bidekap, who, in a crassly materialistic liberalism, transferred the theory of the survival of the fittest to the social sphere, and contended that nothing could be done for the workman because he was engaged with all other workmen in a battle for survival. *Equip the working class with better techniques or greater skills and society would gain something, but there would occur no essential change in the nature of the struggle.*⁸¹

On the other hand evolution and individualism led some Scandinavian thinkers directly into socialism. Treschow, to some degree influenced by Fichte, believed that society would develop toward a collectivist state, in which the individual would be emancipated from economic bondage to capitalists and proprietors. Then only would he be free to cultivate his personality. Henrik Wergeland, who learned much from Treschow and Saint Simon, cherished essentially the same view, with a stronger flavor of utopian socialism.⁸² Howitz's movement for a more scientific criminology can hardly be attributed directly to his evolutionary theory, but certainly to a high degree of individualism. On the other hand, Frederik Dreier's revolutionary socialism, while it was heavily tinged with Marxism, was based squarely upon biological evolution and not at all upon the Hegelian dialectic.⁸³ The cooperative commonwealth envisaged in the 'fifties and 'sixties by F. C. Sibbern, whose philosophical career closely resembled his friend Poul Möller's, is also the logical consequence of evolutionary philosophy. Treschow's influence on Sibbern outlasted Hegel's. Apparently, however, he did not appreciate the significance of Lyell's research in the field of geology, for in the first volume of his work, published the year before Darwin's

great book, he introduces a cataclysm to explain the transformation from a capitalistic to a socialistic state.⁸⁴ A result of romanticism and of the evolutionary theory, the idea of progress was gaining adherents on every hand. Thus the mind furnished theoretical arguments and explanations for economic, social and political events.

IV. THE REASSERTION OF REASON

The flight to simple faith and the purely speculative philosophy did not want for challengers, even at its climax. In the two decades before 1865, reason and science reasserted themselves. Then began a swing of the pendulum which in the 'seventies and 'eighties, under the leadership of Georg Brandes, August Strindberg, Henrik Ibsen, and Björnsterne Björnsen, raised up a new rationalism, founded on more naturalistic premises than that of the eighteenth century. In Germany, Hegel's disciples divided themselves into two groups, right and left. The latter followed the master's evolutionary doctrine, but rapidly abandoned his spiritual conception of the universe for frank materialism. In 1835-36, David Friedrich Strauss, in *Das Leben Jesu*, declared the New Testament a body of mythology, so far as the purported historical facts were concerned; Feuerbach's *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, in 1841, presented a radically materialistic interpretation of theology.⁸⁵ It was this line that Marx and Engels followed through to historical materialism. At the same time in France, Auguste Comte was formulating his positivistic sociological science, based on the dictum that social phenomena must be subjected to essentially the same scientific method as natural phenomena. Scandinavian culture was at first remarkably impervious to the revolutionary import of these philosophical currents. Those who read this critical literature seldom attempted to lead crusades. In the early 'forties, Strauss was introduced to the Swedes, but he "aroused great antipathy and elicited many excellent counter-pamphlets." Geijer dismissed *Das Leben Jesu* with the brief note that it was based on false premises and "not worth so much fuss." Later, Nils Ignell, a pastor in Stockholm, openly denied the chief dogmas of Christianity.⁸⁶ Viktor Rydberg's *Bibels lära om Kristus*, published in 1862, is the first modern theological work in Sweden.

It followed Bruno Bauer and Strauss, but considered the evolution of the individual conscience to be divine revelation. All his life and very much of his work revolved about the Christian symbolism, and he was far from Feuerbach's materialism. Nevertheless, his doctrine of a progressive revelation (evolution) opened a wide breach in the wall of Swedish Lutheran orthodoxy. His book caused an active discussion which developed considerable bitterness, and neither Rydberg nor his opponents could then have foreseen that the time would come when the church itself would offer refuge, even for his ideas, against a still more radical doctrine.⁸⁷

It was in Denmark, however, that critical reason asserted itself first. That country had much more intimate connections with Germany than either Sweden or Norway. Swedish thinkers were wrapped up in the national philosophy of *Boström*, and after 1840 economic and political reform absorbed the leaders almost to the exclusion of philosophical subjects. This was true in Norway also, and philosophy was neglected at the university. In Denmark, however, where the university was located in the city of Copenhagen, the center of economic and political activity, philosophy ranked high. Furthermore, the Danes are more inclined by national character to cold, intellectual criticism than the two sister nations. The country is small and compact; business and agriculture require prudence for success; headlong adventures imitating spectacular foreign successes cannot safely be risked; and in all of Danish thought there is a strong strain of peasant scepticism and conservatism. The Dane is therefore, even more than the Swede or the Norwegian, an ingrained individualist, who shies away from every extravagance of claim and expression. "Indeed, our shy aversion to going beyond the beaten path of everyday life in our mode of expression is so great that 'we almost blush when we are visited by our genius or our muses.'" The Danes have a favorite saying to the effect that "What you cannot say briefly, you do not know."⁸⁸ No wonder that the complexities and the profundities of the German idealistic philosophy aroused in many Danes a wholesome suspicion of its sincerity. Individual critics, like Kierkegaard and Dreier, might react so violently against it that they oversimplified, but

in its origin that very reaction was a manifestation of the sober national character.

The eighteen forties was a decade of ferment in Danish history. Economic life was more vigorous. The currency was stable, the provincial towns had developed activities more or less independent of Copenhagen, and the merchants and industrialists of that city were rapidly discovering exhilarating tasks. Agriculture had come out of its post-war crisis, and was resuming progress toward capitalism.⁸⁹ The demand for freedom of trade was loudly voiced. The mounting conflict of Danish and German nationalism in Schleswig-Holstein excited the rising generation. All of these upsurging forces found political expression in the National Liberal and Peasant parties. Life was young again, and youth was climbing into the saddle. Denmark swarmed with "stormtroopers," each with his favorite citadel to storm. And in the field of philosophy stood the solitary Søren Kierkegaard, who robbed Scandinavian thought of its repose.

Søren Kierkegaard was born in Copenhagen in 1813, where he also died in 1855. His home environment in childhood was gloomy, for his father suffered a melancholia bordering on insanity. The boy himself was physically undersized and weak; all his life he was conscious of being apart from other people, different. He developed feelings of inferiority which he compensated by glorifying his difference and strengthening his natural individualism. He never lived a normal human life; his brief engagement to a young woman was broken and served but to deepen his pessimism. Kierkegaard was a close student of philology and philosophy, but not of the natural sciences, a gap that must be borne in mind in any discussion of his work. In 1835 he wrote to his brother-in-law, Vilhelm Lund, who had emigrated to Brazil, that he admired the sciences and realized from the examples of H. C. Ørsted, J. F. Schouw and Hornemann what harmony of philosophy might be achieved thereby. But he would not make them his chief object of study, because he was more interested in "life as reason and freedom."

The 40 years of wandering in the desert, before I could reach the promised land of science, seem to me to be too precious. And that all

the more, because I believe that nature may also be viewed from the angle in which an understanding of the secrets of science is unnecessary.⁹⁰

Between him and his teacher Poul Möller there existed a close friendship, one of the few deep attachments that Kierkegaard ever formed. Möller, who had himself broken away from Hegel's system at a time when it required character to do so, certainly contributed to accentuate his pupil's individualism, as he did that of Schweigaard, and helped to develop in him that stark sense of the irreconcilability of faith and reason which was fundamental in Kierkegaard's outlook.⁹¹ Since he resolved every fundamental problem into a matter of religion, and since he was an extremely intense personality, consciousness of that irreconcilability drove him almost to the verge of madness.

Mention has been made of Kierkegaard's individualism. It is more accurately described as subjective individualism. Kierkegaard's ideal man is a far more solitary being than Nietzsche's superman; the latter was at least conceived as living with, and leading, the masses. The crowd has no significance or value whatever for Kierkegaard. What the mass thinks, or does, or is, matters nothing. The subjective individual is everything. He alone is responsible. If the problem be one of religion it is for the individual to seek his personal salvation by a personal, and absolutely sincere, act of faith. If it be one of ethics, then the individual must enter into himself, have intercourse with himself, impregnate himself, and make himself fruitful. The difference between the ethical man and the merely esthetic man Kierkegaard describes in his most important work, published in 1843, *Enten - Eller (Either - Or)*:

The point of distinction, about which everything revolves, is this, that the ethical individual is transparent unto himself and does not live *ins Blaue hinein* in the manner of the esthetic individual. With this difference everything is explained. He who lives ethically has seen himself, knows himself, with his consciousness he penetrates his whole concretion; he does not permit indefinite thoughts to meander about inside him, nor does he allow tempting possibilities to divert him with their illusions... He knows himself... When the individual has learned to know himself and has chosen himself, then he is in process of realizing himself, but when he is about to freely realize himself, then he must know what it is he wants to realize. That which he wants to realize must necessarily be himself, but it is his ideal self, which, however, he can find nowhere but in himself. If one does not cling to this, that the individual has his ideal self within himself, then

his writing and his desire become abstract. He who tries to copy another human being, and he who tries to copy the normal human being, both become, though in differing manners, equally affected.⁹²

The merely esthetic individual, on the other hand, is interested only in his superficialities, in the unusual or paradoxical about himself, and when he seriously devotes himself to a study of those qualities, he becomes only a "grimace of a man." In the next sentence Kierkegaard expresses his contempt for the herd:

The reason why we seldom meet with such figures in life is, that we so seldom meet people who have any notion of what it is to live. But since many people have a pronounced fondness for talking, we meet on the street, in company and in books a great deal of talk which bears an unmistakable imprint of that craze for originality, which, if it were carried out in life, would enrich the world with a mass of art objects, the one more ridiculous than the other.⁹³

The inevitable culmination of the self-analysis which the ethical man must carry through is this, that so far as he himself is concerned he becomes the one and only man. But the true art of living is yet more difficult, for every natural object is a thing unto itself; the true art of living consists in being the only man in such a way that the individual is also the embodiment of totality.⁹⁴

Faith and reason Kierkegaard saw were completely irreconcilable. But when he spoke of faith, he did not mean faith in any particular official set of so-called Christian dogma. Kierkegaard had read Pascal carefully, and agreed with him that the Christian religion is an attitude, not a doctrine. This attitude must become the governing principle of the individual personality by an act of passionate will, a determination to believe. If a thing could be demonstrated rationally or scientifically, its acceptance would not constitute faith. But if anyone should find it necessary, in order to "realize himself," to believe the opposite of what could thus be proved, his passionate embrace of it would be faith. The passion would mark it as a true faith, because it would indicate that the individual grasped the rationally absurd in full consciousness and only after a serious struggle with himself. The facts of the objective world, that is, science, might be ever so logically conclusive, but to Kierkegaard they would not be conclusive, "simply because conclusion is subjective, essentially passionate, particularly a function of a

person's immeasurably interested personal passion for his eternal salvation."⁹³ Certainty he held to be the greatest enemy of faith, and since faith is absolutely essential man must ever seek to be a mystery to himself and to others.⁹⁶ What a man believes is unimportant; his sincerity in seeking the truth is supremely important.⁹⁷

In the emphasis that Kierkegaard placed upon the will to believe, he resembled Schopenhauer. He also viewed life with an intense pessimism. But it was a pessimism somewhat different from Schopenhauer's. Kierkegaard at least found some moments of comfort in his religion. Yet he despaired utterly of the great mass of humanity, particularly when it seemed to him that their individual self-reliance was being lulled by paternalistic governments. His despair, however, was based, not so much upon the scorn of the superior intellect, as upon a great disappointed love for man. Physical and mental suffering was so much a part of Kierkegaard's life, that he could not conceive of true living without it. In his happier moments, he elevated suffering to the plane of ethics; but when depressed he could write: "My time I divide thus: half of the time I sleep, the other half I dream. When I sleep I never dream. That would be sin, for to sleep is the highest originality."⁹⁸

Kierkegaard's philosophy brought him into sharp controversy with the church. He was far too individualistic to admire an institution. Religion was to him a passionately personal matter, which could only grow hypocritical when institutionalized. Mere outward membership or service in the church would take the place of painful sincerity. Inevitably, therefore, Kierkegaard must war upon the leaders of the Danish church, especially upon Mynster, Martensen, and Grundtvig. A master of withering sarcasm, he fought with intense emotion. He never feared for his own future, and therefore spared no language, softened no truth, never compromised. The difference between the free-thinker and official Christianity, he wrote, is that the former openly and honestly declares that Christianity is poetry, whereas the latter solemnly avers that it is absolute truth but by placing the emphasis upon mass conformity robs it of all personal reality, and therefore actually makes it poetry.⁹⁹ By "free-thinkers" Kierkegaard specifically referred to Feuerbach and Strauss. When Martensen, his for-

mer tutor, in 1854 referred to the late Bishop Mynster as a "witness for the truth", Kierkegaard could not contain himself. Mynster had always defended the existing order, and had thus made "a fool of God." To be a witness for the truth is to suffer hardship and scorn for what one believes to be right. Mynster had enjoyed honors and security; the profession of the truth had been a means of good living to Mynster.¹⁰⁰ Later, in the course of the feud, he defied the whole religious officialdom:

This has to be said; then be it said:

Whoever you are, whatever your life may be, my friend, by desisting (supposing you do not now take part) from participation in public worship as it is now conducted (with its claim to be the Christianity of the New Testament), you will be guilty of one and a great sin less; you will not be party to making a fool of God by calling New Testament Christianity what is not New Testament Christianity.¹⁰¹

The clergy he called a *guld of spiritual tinsmiths*, "which had gotten control of the firm of Jesus Christ, and had done a big business."¹⁰²

No one has more pitilessly limned Grundtvig than Sören Kierkegaard, and yet with real understanding of his greatness. The "incomparable discovery" of Grundtvig that true religion is to be found less in the Bible than in the folk-church, Kierkegaard described as begging the question. Grundtvig despaired of being able to reconcile faith and reason on the basis of the Bible; therefore he conveniently discovered a new basis for his faith. This Kierkegaard denounced as bad reason and bad faith. Reason, or science, is what it is, and must be honestly dealt with; its conclusions, if at variance with religion, must be clearly recognized and deliberately set aside by an act of wilful faith. What was glorious in Grundtvig, Kierkegaard held, was precisely that as a poet "he was confused and that he was moved by the immediate passion"; therefore he considered it almost un-Christian to find repose in the confidence of salvation through baptism.¹⁰³ To the credit of Grundtvig be it said that when he wanted the state church freed of doctrinal bonds, he was hoping to enable such an individual genius as Kierkegaard to work *within* it and not *without*.¹⁰⁴

"When Kierkegaard died, though still a young man, he had achieved what he desired,—to create difficulties. He made it difficult to be Christian without thereby making it easier to be

a Hellene."¹⁰⁵ He had knocked the props out from under both the official religious structure and the grandiose speculative philosophy. Personal sincerity alone remained of value. That he himself chose to believe the most extreme form of Christian doctrine does not alter this statement, for he made it abundantly clear that he chose in deliberate denial of reason. His insistence upon the conflict between reason and faith, together with his demand that the individual think sincerely, that is, clearly and logically, made it extremely difficult for his readers to tolerate philosophical muddle-headedness. Kierkegaard splits the philosophical stream, commanding one branch to take the course marked "fanatical faith" and the other the course marked "human reason,—the final authority." It is impossible to guess his future development had he lived longer. His own life illustrates an essential element in his philosophy, namely that no ideal can be absolute because all things are in a state of never-ending development. That his intellectual processes would have crystallized in 1855 is impossible to suppose. But he might have gone farther in the direction of faith, and as suggested by Höffding have come to rest with John Newman in the fold of Catholicism.¹⁰⁶ Georg Brandes, however, held that Kierkegaard would most probably have moved in the direction of reason,¹⁰⁷ though he, too, admits the possibility of Catholicism. But Kierkegaard had done a full life's work when he was stopped by death. Probably the most correct estimate was written by Brandes in the midst of the struggle over "Faith and Science" (*Tro og Viden*) in 1867, a struggle which was to become an important milepost in Scandinavian cultural history, and to which Kierkegaard's work was introductory. Brandes wrote:

Kierkegaard is, to be sure... a tremendous spirit, one of the sort which is born hardly once in a century, but Kierkegaard was the Tycho Brahe of our philosophy. He is great as Tycho Brahe, but like the astronomer he does not dare, in his blind awe of authority, to put the center of our system in its sun. In astronomy this sun is a body; in philosophy it is called reason.

But just as little as succeeding generations were prevented by Tycho Brahe's error from drawing full advantage of his work, just so little will Kierkegaard be overthrown by that which is positive in morals and religion.¹⁰⁸

Sören Kierkegaard did not write for the masses, and the

masses do not read him. But very few thoughtful Scandinavians, especially Danes and Norwegians, have been untouched by his influence. Ibsen is known to have read *Enten - Eller* when writing *Brand*, and the great Norwegian poem might almost be termed Ibsen's version of Kierkegaard's work. "Time and again, even constantly, as one reads *Brand*, one seems to hear Kierkegaard speak:

Be what you are with all your heart,
And not by pieces and in part."¹⁰⁹

August Strindberg was deeply moved. In Norway the reading of *Oieblikket* (*The Moment*) and other of his works produced minor secessions from the state church, and led many of the best students to avoid the clerical profession. In Denmark all the leading participants in the debates on "Faith and Science," beginning in 1866, had been influenced by Kierkegaard. The controversy began when young Brandes attacked the dualism of Professor Rasmus Nielsen, who had been so far seized by Kierkegaard's views that he set himself, at the age of forty, to study the sciences in order to get nearer to reality. Brandes himself owed not a little to Kierkegaard, although he had dipped deeply into French and English positivism. Hans Bröchner, another participant in the discussion, had been a personal friend of Kierkegaard, but had early broken with Christianity. Neither Nielsen, nor Bröchner, nor F. C. Sibbern, however, were ever able to lay completely aside the Hegelian dialectic; therefore they were arrayed against Brandes and his friends, who insisted upon a thoroughgoing monism, strict adherence to the scientific method, and a philosophy based upon sensory experience. These men in Denmark, a small group of Norwegian intellectuals (Ibsen, A. O. Vinje, Poul Botten-Hansen, J. Ernst Sars, H. E. Berner, and others), but almost no one in Sweden, constituted the dawn of a new era in Scandinavian thought. They appear about the year 1865. The Swedish intellectual rebel, C. L. Almquist, had a decade before Kierkegaard taken the same position against the institutional church in *Kapellet* (*The Chapel*), *Prästens Ställning* (*The Minister's Attitude*), and *Är Kyrkan Guds Egendom eller är den Prelaturens Egendom?* (*Is the Church the Property of God or the Property of the Prelates?*); but his influence was much less.¹¹⁰

The empirical philosophy of this new generation had been vigorously expressed some fifteen years earlier by Frederik Dreier, but it died when he died and left almost no traces. Death, as a matter of fact, took a heavy toll of the younger Danish thinkers in the early 'fifties. Kierkegaard died in 1855; Frederik Dreier in 1853; and two of Dreier's very small group of radical friends, Karl Koch and Ohlsen-Bagge in 1851 and 1853, respectively. This, together with the post-revolutionary reaction, and Danish preoccupation with the Schleswig-Holstein question, kept the views of Dreier from wide acceptance. Therefore "he came but to stand as a herald, announcing that romanticism had reached the end of its time and that it was necessary to assume a sober position with reference to reality, both in theory and practice."¹¹¹ He was but twenty-six when he died, but he had already achieved an impressive authorship. A physician by profession, he spent two years in the Danish army during the hostilities with Prussia, and yet was able to read more widely, and think more broadly than any of his contemporaries except Kierkegaard. In addition, he found time to organize socialist clubs during the revolutionary crisis of 1848. His contemporaries recognized him as a learned man and a formidable antagonist.

Dreier excluded all mysticism, basing his thought on material evolution. Man can know his environment only by experience, that is, science. He denounced one of the world's greatest scientists, H. C. Ørsted, for allowing speculative philosophy and religion to tempt him into admitting dualism; for himself he contended that mind and matter were identical. Dreier based his psychology squarely upon physiology; he described the function of the nervous system and the brain with great accuracy, contended that there was some relation between the size and weight of the brain and the degree of intelligence, and concluded, "that which has heretofore been called soul is nothing but the activity of the brain."¹¹² Sensory experience plus inductive reasoning he held to be the way to knowledge. Kierkegaard and H. C. Ørsted, though dualists, had each, in his way contributed to diminish regard for the clergy, and for this Dreier gave them credit.¹¹³ For Hegel and his nebulous system Dreier naturally had no respect, although he recognized the bifurcation of his followers, and enumerated the successive

stages of the left line: Strauss, Feuerbach, Max Stirner, Marx and Engels.¹¹¹ For the origin of religion and the history of its development, Drier had a naturalistic, animistic explanation.¹¹⁵ All of this debris of mysticism, he held, must be cleared away by the new critical philosophy. Frederik Dreier wanted man to take his fate into his own hands. How boldly he applied his philosophy to social problems is demonstrated elsewhere.¹¹⁶ The results of his critical philosophy he summarized in the following words:

Nature is no longer a mysterious clockwork, or a piece of machinery operated by mechanics,—“Gods,” “powers,” “spirits,”—hidden up above or behind the curtains. Its phenomena are produced by the interaction of the elements it contains, and can probably not be finally understood, that is embraced, in a single final formula; but they may be progressively studied and classified in ever more general and accurate expressions, formulas, and laws.

Man was not created in a manner very different from other natural objects; he is but the last stage in nature's preceding evolution, bound to the conditions of life on this earth in such a manner, that upon death the life of every particular human being is finished, and his component parts revert to other functions in the great cycle. Man is thus not obligated to obey certain definite and forever established laws, he is predestined for neither this nor that, but he takes out of life itself the general rules to which he decides to conform; he himself determines how his life shall be lived. The human will certainly is not free in the sense that it might function independently of thought, that is sensation, which in turn is in constant reciprocal relation with surrounding life; but it is free in this sense, that there is not any mundane or supermundane protocol decreed that thus or so must man behave whether he will or no.

And the most important thing of all is that this hypocritical, insane life, to which we are chained, is not rightfully lord over us. We are free men, who may transform it according to our desires and our need just as soon as we are strong enough to tear asunder our chains.¹¹⁷

The philosophy of induction and its applicability to human problems has rarely been better stated.¹¹⁸

By 1865 the period of mere speculative thought was definitely at an end in Denmark. In Sweden and Norway it was still firmly entrenched in the universities, but outside of them were small groups of thoughtful, earnest men, who were determined to stake their lives on a rational philosophy based on scientific method.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

- ¹ Lütken, F. C., *Ökonomske tanker* (Copenhagen, 1756-1761), I part 3, 20.
- ² Schück, Henrik och Warburg, Karl, *Illustrerad svensk litteraturohistoria* (Stockholm, 2nd enlarged ed., 1911-1916), III, 192.
- ³ Petander, K., *De nationalekonomiska åskådningarna i Sverige sådana de framträdde i litteraturen* (Stockholm, 1912), I, 76; Wrangel, Ewert, *Frilhetstidens odlingshistoria ur litteraturens hälfder*, 1718-1733 (Lund, 1895), 105-106.
- ⁴ Petander, *op. cit.*, 32-33.
- ⁵ Bisgaard, H. L., *Den danske nationaløkonomi i det 18:de aarhundrede* (Copenhagen, 1902), *passim*; Petander, *op. cit.*, 76-101.
- ⁶ *Cf. post*, I, 36-7.
- ⁷ Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 192-3; *Then swanska argus*, I (1733), no VIII.
- ⁸ *Cf. post*, I, 24.
- ⁹ Salander, Erik, *Systematisk nödhjelps tancker eller okulstötliga grund-satzer til wälgång för höga och låga i et fattigt land, der penningen har rymt, näringen ligger öde och winsten är försvunnen, begrundade af en som busker allas wäl-måga* (Gothenburg, 1730).
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 11-13; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 109-10.
- ¹¹ Berch's chief writings are *Sätt att igenom politiskt arithmetica utröna länders och rikens hushållning* (Stockholm, 1746), and *Inledning till almätta hushållningen* (Stockholm, 1747). *Cf. also* Petander, *op. cit.*, 51-56, and Schuck och Warburg, *op. cit.*, III, 195-199.
- ¹² *Cf.* his chief work, *Sveriges högsta wälstånd byggt uppå en oeconomisk grundwal* (Stockholm, 1738).
- ¹³ His contribution to mercantilistic thought was *Arcana oeconomia comercii, eller handelns och hushållnings warkets hemligheter* (Stockholm, 1730). Even as early as this, however, he has an eye for the beneficent effects of a free, representative government and of individual initiative and enterprise. *Cf. also* Wrangel, *op. cit.* 11.
- ¹⁴ This is an interesting illustration of the ability of the better type of pietism (Pontoppidan) to cooperate with the enlightenment (Moltke) in the promotion of a thoroughly mundane matter.
- ¹⁵ Gjellerup, S. M., "Erik Pontoppidan," in *Dansk biografisk lexikon*, XIII, 217; Nielsen, Axel, *Dänische wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Jena, 1933), 119-120.
- ¹⁶ Bisgaard, *op. cit.*, 7-8, Lütken, F. C., *op. cit.*, *passim*.
- ¹⁷ Bachmannson, *Arcana oeconomiae* . . . , I, 53.
- ¹⁸ Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 304; *cf. also* Arosenius, "Sweden," in (Koren, John ed.), *History of statistics; their development and progress in many countries* (N. Y. 1918), 549; Sundbärg, Gustav, *Emigrationsutredningen, betänkande* (Stockholm, 1913), 47.
- ¹⁹ Malthus, Thomas Robert, *Essay on the principles of population* (London, 1803), I, 394-6, and *passim*.
- ²⁰ Jensen, "Denmark," in Koren, ed., *History of statistics*, 201-214; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 288-9.
- ²¹ *Cf. post*, I, 36-37.
- ²² Odhner, Clas Theodor, *Sveriges politiska historia under Gustaf III's regering* (Stockholm, [1885-1905]), I, 345-347; Petander, *op. cit.*, 119-202; Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 119-207.
- ²³ Rohdlieb, Curt, *Johan Fischerström. En studie i upplysningstidens tankeliv* (Malmö, 1926).
- ²⁴ Chydenius, Anders, *The national gain* (London, 1931); "Chydenius, Anders," in *Encyclopedia of the social sciences*, III, 468; Heckscher, Eli F., *Ekonomi och*

historia (Stockholm, 1922), 233; Odhner, *op. cit.*, I, 595-8; Schauman, Georg, *Biografiska undersökningar om Anders Chydenius* (Helsingfors, 1908), *passim*; Schuck och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 202-203.

²⁵ Cf. *post*, I, 72-80.

²⁶ Bisgaard, *op. cit.*, 18-19, and 183-4; Jensen, in *Det danske folks historie* (Ed. by Aage Friis, et al., Copenhagen, 1927-1929), VI, 343; Lindström, Henri, *Näringsfrihetens utveckling i Sverige 1809-36, Akad. afh.*, (Göteborgs högskolas årsskr., 1923, 5) (Gothenburg, 1923), 102; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, 288-9; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 121-123; Westergaard, H., "Lütken, O. D." in *Dansk biografisk lexikon*, X, 554-5; Wohlin, Nils, *Den svenska jordstreckningspolitiken i de 18de och 19de århundradena* (Stockholm, 1912), 459-61.

²⁷ Malthus, *op. cit.*, I, 385-6.

²⁸ Compare the moderate criticism directed against them by F. C. Lütken, *op. cit.*, I (part 3), 79-83, with the sharp denunciation by Bull, A., "Om Flaandværkerne i Christiania," in *Topographisk journal for Norge*, I (1791-1792), no. 3, 74-115. The carpenters' and tailors' guilds in Christiania did not omit to answer Bull. Cf. also, Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 222.

²⁹ Linvald, in *D. F. H.* VI, 159-161; Nyrop, C., in Carlsen, *Danmarks kultur* (Copenhagen 1900) 694. The best study of the guilds in Denmark is, Nyrop, C., *Den danske ernevoldsmagt og lavene* (Copenhagen, 1909); Scharling, William, in Falbe-Hansen, V. og Scharling, William, *Danmarks statistik*, (Copenhagen, 1887), II, 445-7.

³⁰ Lindström, *op. cit.* 104-105; Odhner, *op. cit.* I, 356.

³¹ Arnberg, J. W., *Anteckningar om frihetstidens politiska ekonomi* (Stockholm, 1868) 77 and *passim*. (the best study of Swedish mercantilism); Danielsson, Carl, *Protektionismens genombrött och tulltaxerevisionerna 1715 och 1718* (Stockholm, 1930); Holm, in *D. H. R.*, V, 115-6, 172; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 238-239; Norlind, Tobias, *Svenska allmogens lif* (Stockholm, 1912), 444-447; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 105-6.

³² One daler s.m. (silver) was equivalent to \$1.07.

³³ Malmström, C. G., *Sveriges politiska historia från konung Karl XII's död till statshöfvingen 1772* (Stockholm, 2nd rev. ed., 1893-1901) II, 247-8 says that factories (1756) employed over 50,000 and the textile industry alone, 14,000; cf., also, Malmström, *op. cit.*, II, 321, and *passim*; Stavenow, *op. cit.*, 284.

³⁴ One rigsdaler was equivalent to \$0.86.

³⁵ Bosse, Ewald, *Norwegens volkswirtschaft vom ausgang der hansaperiode bis zur gegenwart*... (Jena, 1916), I, 396; Holm, in *D. H. R.*, V, 174; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 239.

³⁶ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 226-228, and 338-340; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 175; Johnsen, Oscar Albert, in, *Norges historie fremstillet for det norske folk*, (Oslo, 1909-1917), VI, 234-241; Steen, in *Det norske folks liv og historie* (Ed. by Edvard Bull, Oslo, 1929-1935), VI, 229-234.

³⁷ Malmström, *op. cit.*, II, 94-95, and 325; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 245-248.

³⁸ Grimberg, Carl, *Svenska folkets underbara öden* (Stockholm, 1916), V, 600-601, where Polhem is quoted.

³⁹ Ekegård, Einar, *Studier i svensk handelspolitik under den tidigare frihetstiden* (Upsala, 1924), 118-126; Heckscher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 264-294; Linné, Carl von, *Wästgöta resa, på rikens högloftige ständers befallning förrättad år 1746*... (Gothenburg, 1928), 132-143; Malmström, *op. cit.* VI, 91-93; Palmblad, W. F., "Historisk blick öfver den svenska näringsfrihetens utveckling," in *Scandia, tidskr. för vetenskap och konst*, V (1835) 11-22; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 106-108; *Biographiskt lexicon öfver namnkunniga svenska män*, I, 145-158; Stråle, G. H., *Alingsås manufacturverk. Ett bidrag till den svenska industriens historia under frihetstiden*, (Stockholm), 1884, *passim*; Sundbärg, *op. cit.*, 77; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 106-109.

⁴⁰ Sverre Steen's account of Norwegian development in this period is the best, *N. F. L. H.*, VI, *passim*, based as it is on the researches of the past and a mass of archival material never used before.

⁴¹ Bobé, "Lystrejser," in *Historiske meddelelser om København*, I R., IV

(1913-15), 514-6; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 115-124; Scharling, in *Falbe-Hansen og Scharling*, *op. cit.*, II, 457.

⁴² Drachmann, Paul, *Industrial development and commercial policies of the three Scandinavian countries* (N. Y., 1915), 36; Nystrom, J. F., *Bidrag till svenska handelns och naringarnas historia under senare delen af 1700-talet* (Upsala, 1884), *passim* (still the standard authority on this period); Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 402-3, 409-411, 427-8, and X, 7, 38-9.

⁴³ For a contemporaneous defense of the mercantilistic policy, cf. Hoffmann, Friedrich, *Fabrikeens flori, som et middel til Danmarks opkomst* (Copenhagen, 1772); Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 337; Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 39-48.

⁴⁴ Büsch, *Bemerkungen auf einer reise durch einen teil Schwedens im jahr 1780* (Hamburg, 1783), 51-2, and *passim*; Malthus, *op. cit.*, I, 371-2.

⁴⁵ Olsen, "Nogle synspunkter for dansk merkantilistik erhvervspolitik," in *Scandia, udskr. for historisk forskning*, III, (October, 1930), 223-273.

⁴⁶ Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 105-6.

⁴⁷ Usher, A. P., *History of mechanical inventions* (N.Y., 1929), 340.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 338-340; Ekegård, *op. cit.*, 146; Grumberg, *op. cit.*, V, 587-601; Schuck och Waiburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 208-215.

⁴⁹ *Dagens Nyheter* (Stockholm), June 13, 1932; Eubank, Thos., *Descriptive and historical account of hydraulic and other machines* (N.Y., 2nd ed., 1847); Giansstrom, F. A., "Libert Wolters i Rio Tinto," in *En bergsbok; några studier öfver svensk bergshantering tillägnade Carl Sahlin*, (Stockholm, 1921), 6-20; Lamm, Martin, *Svedenborg. En studie öfver hans utveckling till mystiker och andeskådare* (Stockholm, 1915); 23-24; Waerland, Are, "Måiten Triewald and the first steam engine in Sweden," in *Newcomen Society, transactions* (1926-27), VII (1928), 24-41; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 105-6.

⁵⁰ *Cf. post*, I, 261.

⁵¹ *Cf.*, e.g., the accounts of Hermelin's travels in the United States and Swedenstjerna's in the United Kingdom: Hermelin, Samuel Gustaf, "Report about the mines in the United States of America," (Translated and edited by Amandus Johnson), in *Swedish-American historical bulletin*, IV, (February, 1931), 7-54; Swedenstjerna, Erich Thomas, *Resa igenom en del af England och Skottland åren 1802 och 1803* (Stockholm 1804). Swedenstjerna's account appeared in a German translation by J. G. L. Blumhof in 1811.

⁵² The mercantilistic economists were divided on the question of the social utility of labor saving machinery. Generally speaking, those of Sweden recognized the danger of allowing private owners too much freedom in their use. *Cf.*, Petander, *op. cit.*, 44-46. But in Denmark, where no one had any experience with machinery, it was an object of envy to C. F. Lütken; *op. cit.*, II, (part V), 82-3.

⁵³ Witttrup, Lorenz, *Beskrivelse over den søndenhjelds brugelige tiere-ovn*, (Trondhjem, 1778).

⁵⁴ Smith, Laurids, *Vel anvendte borgerlige velgjerninger*, (Trondhjem, 1783), 16-17.

⁵⁵ Anker, Bernt, in *Topographisk journal for Norge*, II (1793-4), no 1, 128-234. In the same journal, IV (1796), no. 3, 83-92, there is a report on the use of this machine. Nothing worth mining had been discovered, but the society was by no means without hope.

⁵⁶ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 297-325; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 212, part 2, 58-9, 183-4; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 249-256.

⁵⁷ Palmblad, "Historisk blick," *etc.*, *loc. cit.*, V, 34-40; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 289, and X, 278.

⁵⁸ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 345-348; Smith, S. B., in *Den norske sjøfarts historie*, ed. by Jacob S. Worm-Müller (Oslo, 1924-), III, Part I, 39-137.

⁵⁹ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 326-334; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 212-271, and V, part 2, 286-289. Dr. Clarke is quoted in Forester, Thomas, ed., *Norway and its Scenery*, (London, 1853) *passim*; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 244-6.

⁶⁰ Lipson declares that "Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the iron manufactured here [England] came from abroad," in the eighteenth century. Russian iron began to be imported there about 1714, and by 1786 considerably exceeded the Swedish in quantity, but the Swedish production was in unfailing demand because of its quality.

Lipson, Ephraim, *Economic history of England* (London, 1931-), II, 160-161, and III, 296.

⁶¹ Ekegård, Einar, *op. cit.*, 295.

⁶² Hecksher, Eli, F., *Un grand chapitre de l'histoire du fer: le monopole suédois* (Reprint of articles in *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*, IV), 234.

⁶³ For the history of the Swedish tar monopoly, see Fyhrvall, Oscar, "Bidrag till svenska handelslagstiftningens historia. 1. Tjarhandelskompanierna," in *Historiskt bibliotek*, VII (1880), 287-349. Linné wrote a good description of the Swedish tar production techniques in 1749; cf. *Skånska resa, på höga öfverhetens befallning förrättad år 1749, med rön och anmärkningar uti oecnomien, naturulier, antiquiteter, seder, lefnads-sätt. Med ulhörige figurer* (Stockholm, 1751), 54-56.

⁶⁴ The contest which waged sporadically between the English iron-mongers, who wanted the supply of raw iron increased and cheapened by colonial production, and the ironmasters, who wished to prevent colonial competition, was watched in Sweden with great concern. The experiments made in England with coal as a smelting fuel seemed less alarming. Lipson describes the contest over the encouragement of colonial iron, in *op. cit.*, III, 185-189; for the Swedish side see Hecksher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 175-183.

⁶⁵ Excellent historical studies of the Swedish iron industry as affected by governmental economic policies have been made by Professor Hecksher, *Un grand chapitre, etc., passim*; and "Den gamla svenska brukslagstiftningens betydelse," in *En bergsbok . . . (till) Carl Sahlén*, 169-185. Cf., also Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 22-24, 28-29; Schauman, *op. cit.*, 134-140; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 285.

"The memory of what the ancient class of works masters . . . have contributed to the life of our communities in the way of cultural distinction, color, and zest has been preserved for the future in the picturizations that are already classic. Here it shall but be recalled, that two of the most outstanding figures in our literature, Geijer and Tegnér, emanated from this milieu at the time of its zenith. Perhaps it ought also to be specially noted that the export industry served to direct the public gaze outward and thus to counteract the restricted provincialism which otherwise so strongly characterized Swedish culture." Boëthius, Bertil, "Svensk brukshistoria; några randteckningar till den nyare litteraturen," in *Nordisk tidskr.* (Letterstedt), XXXVI (1923), 164.

⁶⁶ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 334-335; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 212, and 271-272; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 34-35, and 239-240.

⁶⁷ Agardh, C. A. och Ljungberg, C. E., *Försök till en statsekonomisk statistik öfver Sverige* (Karlstad and Stockholm, 1852-1863), IV, 246-7; Linné, *Wästgöta resa*, 277.

⁶⁸ Milton, *Paradise Lost*, book I.

⁶⁹ Hecksher, ". . . Brukslagstiftningens betydelse," in *En bergsbok . . .*, 169-176.

⁷⁰ Cf. *ante*, I, 31-32.

⁷¹ Such mills began to be used in Sweden and Norway about the middle of the sixteenth century, but hand sawing with fine blades existed in northern Sweden as late as 1800. Cf. Carlgren, Wilh., *De norrländska skogsindustrierna intill 1800-talets mitt. Ett bidrag*. (Stockholm, 1926), 8-9.

⁷² Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 267-296; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 185; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, V, 272-5, and in VI, 192 and 236; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 247-9.

⁷³ Anker, C. J., *Kammerherre Bernt Ankers liv og virksomhed* (Oslo, 1884), 3-7.

⁷⁴ Boëthius, Bertil, "Trävaruexportens genombrott efter det nordiska kriget," in *Hist. tidskr.*, XLIX (1929), 273-298.

⁷⁵ Carlgren, *op. cit.*, 48-80; Örnsköld, Pehr Abraham, *Underdånig berättelse om Wäster Norrlands höfdingedöme till riksdagen 1769*, (Stockholm, 1769) 5-18; Palmblad, "Historisk blick," *loc. cit.*, V, 31-33.

⁷⁶ The many shipwrecks are to be accounted for by the fact that owners preferred to run the risks of the stormy season rather than those of capture by privateers, cf. Tank, Roar, in *Den norske sjøfarts historie*, I, 479; Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 213-214, and 363-367; Johnsen, *N. H.*, V, part 1, 183-4.

⁷⁷ Lipson, *op. cit.*, II, 161.

⁷⁸ Arnberg, *op. cit.*, 8-9; Ekegård, *op. cit.*, 159-170; Petander, *op. cit.*, 3-5; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 63-4.

⁷⁹ Heckscher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 170-210. The duty on colonial iron was reduced to one-seventh of the duty on Swedish iron. The Swedish iron masters greatly feared that this restrictive Swedish commercial policy would impel England to encourage the production of colonial iron as she had that of colonial tar and timber and that the result would be disastrous. There was actually a revival of the movement in England to do that, but the English iron masters, who enjoyed the prospect of more and cheaper iron from the colonies as little as did those of Sweden, prevented it. Cf. especially pp. 208-210. For a contemporary defense of Sweden's right to pursue this policy, cf. Salander, *op. cit.*, 61-63.

⁸⁰ Ekegård, *op. cit.*, 370-376; Heckscher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 211-213.

⁸¹ Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 120; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 289; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 43.

⁸² Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 364; Lütken, *op. cit.*, I, part 1, 65.

⁸³ Tank, in *Den norske sjøfarts historie*, I, 512.

⁸⁴ Cf. here the admirable study by Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 275-278, and the encyclopaedic chapter by Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 387-414.

⁸⁵ The missionary enterprise of the Norwegian pastor Hans Egede, which re-established Dano-Norwegian contact with that island, in 1721, was quite as much commercial as religious.

⁸⁶ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 224-231; Ekegård, *op. cit.*, 488; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, V, 317-318; Nyström, J. F., *De svenska ostindiske kompanierna. Historisk-statistisk framställning* (Gothenburg, 1883), 5-55; Olän, E., *Ostindiska kompaniets saga. Historien om Sveriges märkligaste handelsforetag* (Gothenburg, 1923, 2nd ed.), *passim*; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 51-80.

⁸⁷ For the best discussion of this development, see Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 257-288.

⁸⁸ Heckscher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 226-239.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 218-239; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 102-104, and 289-292.

⁹⁰ Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 247.

⁹¹ Tank, in *Den norske sjøfarts historie*, I, 536-37.

⁹² Hansen, Holger, *Kabinettsstyrelsen i Danmark, 1768-1782: aktstykker og oplysninger* (Copenhagen, 1916-1923), 3 volumes, *passim*.

⁹³ Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 703-710; for the agricultural reforms cf. *post*, I, 276-302.

⁹⁴ Heckscher, *Ekonomi och Historia*, 244-5; Odhner, *op. cit.*, I, 344-60 and 1231; II, 45-57; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, X, 38-9, 294.

⁹⁵ Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 703-710; Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *Danmarks Statistik*, II, 454, and IV, 297-307; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 510-521; Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 153-158.

⁹⁶ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 26-27; Johnson, in *N. H.*, V, part 2, 72; Odhner, *op. cit.*, I, 356-9, and II, 49-51; Sillén, A. W. af, *Svenska handelns och näringarnas historia till år 1809* (Stockholm, 1886), 238, and *passim*.

⁹⁷ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 216-223; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 294-314.

⁹⁸ Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 204.

⁹⁹ Nyström, *op. cit.*, 26-68.

¹⁰⁰ Heckscher, Eli F., *Kontmentalsystemet* (Stockholm 1922), 123, 124, 164-167; Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 206.

¹⁰¹ Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 94; Clausen, Henrik Nikolai, *Optegnelser om mit levneds og min tids historie* (Copenhagen, 1887), 18.

¹⁰² Somhart, Werner, *Der moderne Kapitalismus* (Munich and Leipzig, Verlag von Duncker und Humboldt, 3d ed., 1919), I, 428.

¹⁰³ Brismar, Sven, *Den palmstruchska banken och rikens ständers bank under den karolinska tiden (Sveriges riksbank, 1668-1918, [Stockholm, 1918-1923, 5 vols.], I, 3-79, and *passim*.*

Brismar makes the following claim for the Palmstruch bank: "This is without the slightest doubt one of the most remarkable financial institutions to be found in economic history. It enjoys the distinction of being the world's oldest bank and it can look back upon the most singular development of any such institution, with the exception of the Bank of England. In the most important matters it has been in the forefront. In its original form it gave the world the first bank-notes; after its reconstruction it was the first public bank to institute a general business based on

interest-bearing deposits, and even since that time has undergone, on its own initiative, changes that have been in many instances of an epoch-making nature."

Ibid., 2.

¹⁰⁴ In 1719 it was necessary to melt down gold medals from the museum in order to finance the sending of a courier Malmström, *op. cit.*, II, 76-80; Tesson, *Tesson och Tessmanska*, 335.

¹⁰⁵ Flux, A. W., *The Swedish banking system* (61 congr., 2nd sess., sen. doc., no. 576, in *The publications of the National Monetary Commission*, XVII) (Washington, 1911), 13-29; Hallendorff, Carl, *Rikens standers bank* 1719-1766 (*Sveriges riksbank*, 1668-1918, II), 111-312; Malmström, *op. cit.*, IV, 65-67, 259-262, and 409-414, V, 58-61, 218-221, and 373-376, VI, 24-30, and 188-190; Montgomery, Arthur, *Riksbanken och de valutapolitiska problemen*, 1719-1778 (*Sveriges riksbank*, 1668-1918, III), 1-76, and *passim*; Wessling, C. M., *Die reichsbank und die "enskjilda" banken Schwedens* (Leipzig, 1907), 1-16.

¹⁰⁶ Brisman, *Tiden* 1803-1834, in (*Sveriges Riksbank*, 1668-1918, IV), 9ff.; Montgomery, *op. cit.*, 77-221; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, X, 279-294.

¹⁰⁷ Brisman, *Tiden* 1803-1834, 9-36; Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 276-277.

¹⁰⁸ Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 43-50; Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 164-5; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 293-294.

¹⁰⁹ Protest from Schleswig and Holstein against inclusion in the chaotic currency system of Denmark-Norway was so strong that this provision was rescinded. Bendixen, B. L., *Et omrids af Norges handelshistorie* (Bergen, 1900), 45; Flux, *op. cit.*, 136-137; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 188-196, 257-263, 334-336, 424-426, 521-525, 656-663; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, V, 321; Linvald, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 161-163, 251-256.

For the text of the *Fundation for Rigsbanken*, cf. *Collegial-tidende*, 1813, 73-81, and 93-97; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 342-354.

¹¹⁰ Bendixen, *op. cit.*, 38; Birkeland, M., *Forhandlinger om oprettelsen af en bank i Norge, 1760-1773* (Christiania, 1870); Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 43-50; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, 63-67, 131, and *passim*; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 289-296.

¹¹¹ Cf. *post*, I, 288-291.

¹¹² Kristiansen, Oskar, *Penge, kapital og arbeide. Bidrag til Norges økonomiske historie 1815-1830* (Oslo, 1925), 180-217. This is much the best account of Norwegian economic history for any period. Prof. Jacob S. Worm-Müller has described the crisis in Christiania very well in *Christiania og krisen efter napoleonskrigene* (Oslo, 1922).

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 141-179; Carlgren, *op. cit.*, 108-128; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 315-317; Montgomery, Arthur, *Industrialismens genombrott i Sverige* (Stockholm, 1931), 97-101.

¹¹⁴ Aall, Jacob, *Erindringer som bidrag til Norges historie fra 1800 til 1815* (Oslo, 2nd ed., 1859), 60-62; Heckscher, "Den gamla svenska brukslagsstiftningens betydelse," in *En bergsboek . . . till Carl Sahlén*, 185; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 326-7; Kristiansen, *op. cit.*, 218-257; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 62-65; Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande, passim*.

¹¹⁵ Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 101-2.

¹¹⁶ Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 320-321; cf. also Kristiansen, *op. cit.*, 4-107.

¹¹⁷ Kristiansen, *op. cit.*, 258-231; Kristiansen, Oskar, "Norges skibsfart 1815-30," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 5 R., V (1924), 360-427; Agardh och Ljungberg, *Statsekonomisk statistik över Sverige*, IV, 334-344, shows that Swedish tonnage declined between 1815 and 1820 about one-sixth and the number of vessels from 994 to 819. From the beginning of the century to 1839, the merchant fleet of Copenhagen declined by 50 per cent., cf. Christensen, Villads, *Köbenhavn*, 1840-1857 (Copenhagen, 1912), 367.

¹¹⁸ Cf. the excellent description of Hamburg banking by Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 179-183.

¹¹⁹ Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 355-7; Jørgensen, A. D., in *D. R. H.*, VI, 59-61; Nathanson, Mendel Levin, *Danmarks handel, skibsfart, penge- og finansvæsen fra 1730 til 1830* (Copenhagen, 1832-1834), I, 328-329; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 354-358; Rubow, Axel, *Nationalbankens historie* (Copenhagen, 1925), *passim*; *Collegial-tidende*, XXI, (1818), 249-254, carries the ordinance transforming the *Rigsbank* into *Nationalbanken*.

¹²⁰ Captain C. Colville Frankland of the British Royal Navy no doubt reflected a widely prevalent opinion in Denmark when he wrote that "Financial reforms seem to have achieved the ruin of Denmark; and the national bank has become rich at the expense of half the property of the whole nation." *Narrative of a visit to the courts of Russia and Sweden in the years, 1830 and 1831* (London, 1832, 2 vols.), I, 36.

¹²¹ Schwiegaard, A. M., *Norges statistik* (Oslo, 1840), 137. Table showing increase in silver customs payments and decrease in currency payments, 1815-1838.

¹²² The best accounts of the problem here discussed are to be found in Kristiansen, *Penge, kapital og arbejde*, 107-140, and Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 179-212, 302-307, and 329-330. But see also Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 51-62; Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 377-384; Gjerset, Knut, *History of the Norwegian people*, (N. Y., 1914), 432 and 447-449.

The best first-hand account of Norway's financial difficulties in this period is that of Jørgen Herman Vogt, Secretary of the Department of Finance, *Jørgen Herman Vogts optegnelser om sit liv og sin embedsvirksomhed 1784-1846* (Oslo, 1871), *passim*; the "Robbery Loan" is discussed on p. 59.

¹²³ Buisman, *op. cit.*, 36-90; Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 288-294, 344-72, 425; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 206.

¹²⁴ [Wallmarck], *Historisk-statistisk återblick på Sveriges yttre och inre förhållanden under de sist förflutna trettio åren i anledning af H. M. Konungens regeringjubileum* (Stockholm, 2nd ed., 1843), 188-189.

¹²⁵ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 289; Hoffstad, E., *Kristiania handelsstand* (Oslo, 1915), 41-2; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 361-362; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 318; Norman, George Warde, "Mine erindringer fra Norge," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N), 3 R., V (1899), 186-190; Worm-Müller, *Christiania og krisen efter napoleonskrigene*, 64-5, and *passim*.

¹²⁶ Jacobs, S., Extracts from his diary in *Historiske meddelelser om København*, I R., II (1909-10), 380-408.

¹²⁷ Kristensen, H. P., *Landbrugskrisen i Danmark, 1818-1828* (Copenhagen, 1911), 47-48.

¹²⁸ Kristiansen, *op. cit.*, 162-3.

¹²⁹ *Cf.*, e.g., Bishop C. A. Agardh's *Memoir*, in *Preste-ståndets protokol*, 1834, I, 151.

¹³⁰ Munch, P. A., *Købstadstyrelsen i Danmark fra Kristian IV:s tid til enevoldsmagtens ophør, 1619-1848* (Copenhagen, 1900), II, 104; Nathanson, Mendel Levin, *Udførligere oplysninger om handels- og finansvæsenet i Christian den 7des og Frederik den 6tes regeringstid . . .* (Copenhagen, 1832), 76-92.

¹³¹ Aall, Jacob, *Fortid og Nutid* (Christiania, 1832), III, part 2, 142. The depression, he wrote in 1832, was worse than the cholera; *cf.* Aall, Jacob, *Breve . . . til sorenskriver . . .* G. P. Blom, 1815-1840 (Copenhagen, 1894), 14-15.

¹³² Inglis, Henry David, *A personal narrative of a journey through Norway, part of Sweden, and the islands and states of Denmark*. By Derwent Conway, pseud. (Edinburgh, 1829), 324; Frankland, *op. cit.*, I, 36; Nathanson *Udførligere oplysninger*, 59-76.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, I, 64-65.

¹³⁴ Laing, Samuel, *A tour in Sweden in 1838* (London, 1839), 77.

¹³⁵ Hahn-Hahn, Ida, gräfin, *Travels in Sweden; sketches of a journey to the North*, Translated fr. the German (N. Y., 1845), 18.

¹³⁶ Inglis, *op. cit.*, 284; Schwiegaard, *op. cit.*, 137.

CHAPTER II

¹ Carpenter, Edward, *Towards democracy* (London, 5th edition, 1931), 391.

² After 1660, Danish crown lands were given to nobles in compensation for lands lost when Scania was ceded to Sweden. Favorites, mistresses, and illegitimate children had to be provided for, and the reckless taxation policy of the absolute monarchy brought ruin and foreclosure to thousands of freeholders, whose lands were then assembled and laid out into new estates which quickly passed into the hands

of land speculators and the new nobility. Christensen, C., *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II. *Danske landboforhold under ænealden* (Copenhagen, 1891).

³ As, for example, when Charles XI "reduced" the Swedish nobility.

⁴ Axel Lindvald finds that between 1730 and 1750 the Danish bourgeoisie were rapidly buying up the estates of impecunious noblemen, so that the holdings of the latter were reduced from 75% to 66% of all the land. "Hvem ejede Danmarks jord omkring midten af det 18. aarhundrede," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (D.) 8 R., IV (1912-13), tillægshefte: til Prof. Edvard Holm paa hans 80-aarige fødselsdag den 26. januar 1913 fra den danske historiske forening, 147-158. See Fabricius, Knud, in *D. F. H.*, V, 228-9, where it is held that 64% of the Danish land was owned by noble and bourgeois proprietors in 1688; and Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 173-179.

⁵ The following were some of the outstanding large owners,—Löwenskiöld, Wedel-Jarlsberg, Aall, Anker, Cappelen, and Collett. Cf. Johnson, in *N. H.*, V, part 2, 289.

⁶ In northernmost Norway the system of large estates, without any feudal characteristics, was predominant until far into the nineteenth century. Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 19-21.

⁷ For a remarkable study of the social conflict between the Norwegian peasants on the one hand and Danish officials supported by the townsmen on the other, cf. Koht, Halvdan, *Norsk bondereise* (Oslo, 1926). Similar studies should be made for Sweden and Denmark.

⁸ Palmblad, "Historisk blick," etc., *loc. cit.*, 23-24.

⁹ Thomson, Arth., *Grundskatterna i den politiska diskussionen 1809-1866. Ett bidrag till lantmannapartiets förhistoria. 1. De grundläggande principdiskussionerna 1809-1823 rörande frågorna om all jords lika beskattning och avskaffandet av grundskatterna* (Lund, 1923), 327. A ruling, in 1720, provided that no crown lands, the forests or labor on which were necessary to mineral production, might be sold into freehold. Juhlin-Dannfelt, H., *Lantbrukets historia: Världshistorisk översikt av lantbrukets och lantmannalivets utveckling* (Stockholm, 1925), 382.

¹⁰ Koht, *Norsk bondereise*, 196-206; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 190-192, esp., V, 262-272. Professor Koht's point of view on this important development in Norwegian social history, based as it is upon a study of actual economic conditions, especially those of the market, is far more realistic than that of Professor Oscar Albert Johnsen, *Norges bønder* (Oslo, 1919), 262-272, who follows Sars in attributing the whole development to beneficent legislation. Steen's viewpoint coincides with that of Koht.

¹¹ Koht, *Norsk bondereise*, 204.

¹² Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 10-11; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 179, and 319-321.

¹³ Fabricius, in *D. F. H.*, V, 227-234. As was so often the case, these new practices were introduced largely by foreigners, in this instance the immigrant German nobility.

¹⁴ Malmström, *op. cit.*, II, 98; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott . . .*, 44-47; Överland, O. A., *Norges historie* (Oslo, 1885-1895), V, part 2, 1946; Wohlin, *Den svenska jordätkningspolitiken*, 56-8.

¹⁵ They were called *husmænd* (housemen) in Denmark and in Norway, *torpare* in Sweden. Cf. chapter on labor.

¹⁶ The best study of the agricultural laboring class is Skappel, Simen, *Om husmandsvæsenet i Norge. Dets oprindelse og udvikling* (Oslo, 1922). It is limited to Norway but in the large the same conditions obtained in Sweden and Denmark. Cf., also, Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 192-193.

¹⁷ Juhlin-Dannfelt, *Lantbrukets historia*, 393.

¹⁸ Cf. in this connection, Thomson, *op. cit.*, 327. It was, of course, just as true in Denmark-Norway as in Sweden.

¹⁹ Holm, Edvard, "Frederik IV's landmilit og dens indflydelse paa bondestandens kaar i Danmark," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (D.), 5 R., IV, (1884), 529-619; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 186-187.

²⁰ When absolutism was victorious, in 1660, the old native nobility, always opposed to any extension of royal power, was gradually liquidated, and in its place arose a new nobility consisting largely of German immigrants and bourgeois supporters of

the king. This new nobility, like that of France under Louis XIV, spent much of its time at court, allowing their estates to be managed by agents (*ridefogder*). Steenstrup, Johs. C. H. R., *Den danske bonde og friheden* (Copenhagen, 1888), 112-113.

²¹ The eighteenth century prior to 1784 used to be described by Danish historians as a period of decline for agriculture. Falbe-Hansen showed, however, that in reality, after 1731, prices improved; this, together with the cheapness and abundance of labor, resulted in better farming, increased yield per acre and in the breaking of new soil. Falbe-Hansen, V, *Staatshuands-løsningen og landboreformerne set fra nationaløkonomiens standpunkt* (Copenhagen, 1888), part I, 19-39. Also Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 183.

²² Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 114.

²³ In Eric Salander's manual for managers of estates, every thirtieth sheaf was said to be due to the pastor. *Op. cit.*, 110-111.

²⁴ Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 382; Wohlin, *op. cit.*, 112-120.

²⁵ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 380; Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 121-124; Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 66-76. Not until the promulgation of the law on hunting, May 20, 1740, (text in *Collegialtudente*, XLIII [1840], 721-736) were the Danish peasants freed of their obligation to assist the lords at this sport. Fox-traps and wolf-traps were considered important enough by Linné to be included in his survey, *Wästgöta resa*, 17 and 273.

²⁶ Erik Gustaf Geijer correctly named it a "nomadic agriculture," *Cf.*, *Fattigvårds-frågan*, in *Samlade skrifter* (Stockholm, 1876-1882), I:6, 73. Linné describes this mode of cultivation in *Skånska resa*, 410-412, and King Adolf Fredrik declared in 1752 that in order to end it, private property ought to be clearly separated from the public forests, *Konung Adolf Fredriks berättelse om sin resa till Finland och Sveriges norra landskap år 1752* (*Handlingar rörande Skandinavien historia*, XL, part V), 353-374.

²⁷ Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 404-405.

²⁸ Bosse, *op. cit.*, I, 380; Linné, *Skånska resa*, 215-216; and *Wästgöta resa*, 32 and 249-250.

²⁹ The Scotch physician and natural scientist, Dr. Thomas Thomson, who travelled in Sweden in 1812, wrote that the plough "is very small and light, but clumsy; the body is made of iron, like the Scotch plough, but it has no coulter, and instead of terminating behind in two handles, like our plough, it terminates in one which has a piece of cross wood at its extremity, like the handle of a spade. The ploughman holds it by one hand, while the other is quite at liberty, and he seems to make very little exertion indeed . . . This plough is not intended to go deep; indeed it does little more than just scratch the surface." *Travels in Sweden during the Autumn of 1812* (London, 1813), 85. For a good contemporary account of Scanian agriculture in 1749, *cf.* Linné, *Skånska resa*, 172-176, and *passim*.

³⁰ Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 400-403; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 22-25; Linné, *Skånska resa*, 415; Norlind, *Svenska allmogens lif*, 93-114; Smitt, J., *Norges landbrug i dette aarhundrede* (Oslo, 1883, 2nd revised ed.), 27-42.

³¹ Human urine and other excreta were thought to possess special powers against witchcraft and were recommended in such a serious manual as *Den svenska reddejan* (Westerås, 1772), said to be part two of Salander's *Utförlig gårdsfogde instruction*. *Cf.*, Åkerblom, Fr., *Historiska anteckningar om Sveriges nötkreatursafvel* (Gothenburg, 1891), 104; Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 418-419. The old superstitions died very slowly; a Danish farmer relates that, as late as the 1850's, it was customary to hang the carcass of a fox in the barn as a preventive against abortion in the cows. *Cf.*, Terp, Poul, *Erindringer fra en dansk bondes lange liv* (Clausen, Julius and Rist, P. Fr., eds., *Memoirer og breve*, XL) (Copenhagen, 1923), 7.

³² *Cf.*, e.g., *Danmarks og Norges oekonomiske magazin*, VII (1762), 317-328.

³³ Åkerblom, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Lund, H. V., *Den danske bondes trældom og frihed, festskrift* (Copenhagen, 1888), 96-97; Palmblad, "Historisk blick," *loc. cit.*, 30-31; Smith, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Skappel, Simen, *Træk af det norske kvægbriugs historie i tidsrummet 1660-1814* (Oslo, 1903), 71 pp., *passim*.

³⁴ Wohlin concludes that the standard of living did not improve for the Swedish

peasantry between 1720 and 1800. On the contrary the consumption of spirits and the increase of population tended rather to cause deterioration. *Op cit.*, 707-713.

³⁵ *Op cit.*, 8th ed., 141. *Cf.*, also, Daae, L. L., *Uaar og hungersnod i Norge 1740-1743*, in *Videnskabs selskabet i Christiania, forhandlinger* 1868, 330-338; Olufsen, O., *Misvekst, uaar og hungersnod i Norge*, in *Tidsskrift for det norske landbrug* [Oslo], XXI (1914), 69-81; Worm-Müller, J. S., *Norge gjennom nødssårene. Den norske regjeringskommission 1807-1810* (Oslo, 1918), 329-346.

³⁶ A table showing the yield of crops year by year from 1748 to 1912 (Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutv. betænkning* 58), shows many near or total failures in Sweden before 1800. Thereafter yields become more regular and distribution improves, so that famines, at least, do not occur.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 50 and 74; Daae, "Nodar og hungersnod," etc., *loc cit.* 338; Hellstenius, J., "Skordarna i Sverige och deras verkningar," in *Statistisk tidsskrift*, V (1871), 77-117; Malthus, *op cit.*, 125-144.

³⁸ *Cf. post* I, 191, 199-200.

³⁹ Johnsen, *Norges bonder*, 280; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 215-220; Wohlin, *op cit.* 56-58, and 112-120.

⁴⁰ *Cf.*, in this connection, Sombart, *op cit.*, I, part 2, 767-8.

⁴¹ Tobacco culture spread in Southern and Southeastern Sweden and was still practiced to a considerable extent in 1812, when Dr Thomson visited the country, *op cit.*, 65-66; *Cf.*, also Linne, *Wästgöta resa* 224-245, and *passim* Nielsen, *op cit.*, 183.

⁴² Norway had no university and no special cultural center, therefore she participated only incidentally at first.

⁴³ This was, of course, but the Scandinavian counterpart of a movement common to Western Europe. Tassin no doubt borrowed the epithet from France, where it was also used, *cf.*, Gras, S. N. B., *History of agriculture in Europe and America* (N. Y., 1925), 240.

Tassin's passage, written in 1762, is worth quoting as expressive of the point of view of an old aristocrat, an artist, and a mercantilist. He habitually wrote in French.

'Jamais l'agromanie n'a été au point où elle est aujourd'hui: c'est la maladie épidémique de nos jours. Les modèles multiples de charriers à déficher, à creuser, à labourer, des Cultivateurs, des Aratoires, des Sarcloirs, des Semoirs, imagines par Tull, par du Hamel, par Chateaueux, par la Plombaine, par nos Suédois & [sic] par tant d'autres, sont d'une exécution dispendieuse & ne servent qu'à embrouiller. Pourquoi rendre compliqué un ouvrage dont la simplicité fait l'âme & le succès?'

'Cette manie passera comme toute autre, après avoir empreint notre siècle de sa folie.' *Tessin och Tessiniana* 232-234.

⁴⁴ Dalin deplored that the peasants themselves were ashamed of their work; "even the lowly consider it degrading to learn a trade, and much more so to plough. The Swedes all want to be gentlemen." *Then swanska argus* I (1732), no. 2.

Holberg's hero Niels Klim (Chapter III) is surprised to find that in Potu the peasants are called foster-fathers, or patrons, of the bourgeoisie. "I was amazed at this, recalling the fate of the peasants at home, who suffer a hideous servitude, and where their work is held to be much more base than other occupations which but serve the purposes of luxury, such as cooks, trucksters, dancing masters, etc."

⁴⁵ Petander, *op cit.*, 114-118.

⁴⁶ Juhlin Dannfelt, *op cit.*, 393; Linné, *Skånska resa*, 172-176.

⁴⁷ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 6.

⁴⁸ Text of the program published by Hille, G., ed., "Grev Adam Gottlob Moltke's plan for Frederik d. femtes regering," in *Hist. tidsskrift* (D.), 4 R., IV, (1873-74), 54-55.

The Councillor of State Ryberg made similar suggestions in reply to the request of Chr. VII (Struensee) in 1770. *Cf.* Ryberg's memorial, quoted by Nathanson, *Udfølgende oplysninger om handels- og finants-væsenet*, 4-7.

⁴⁹ *Cf. ante*, I, 20; Bisgaard, *op cit.*, 180.

⁵⁰ Lutken, C. F., *Økonomiske tanker*, I, part 1, 31.

⁵¹ *Den patriotiske tilskuer* VI, (Sept. 2, 1763), 625.

⁵² *Ibid.*, VI (Dec. 30, 1763), 944-945.

⁵³ Cf e g the call to form the *Korresponderende topographiske selskab for Norge*, in *Topographisk journal for Norge* I (1791 1792), 4 5

⁵⁴ Lutken, C F, *op cit* I (part 1), 29

⁵⁵ *Danmarks og Norges oekonomiske magazin*, I (1757), V (1760), and VI (1761), unpaginated

⁵⁶ Juhlin Dannfelt, *op cit*, 383-384

⁵⁷ Hertel, H, 'Det kgl danske landhusholdningsselskab,' in *Den danske landbrug* (Joh Madsen, ed) (Copenhagen, 1906), III, 48 58, Overland, *N H*, V, part 2, 1941

⁵⁸ Egeström, Fr, *Den svenska lantbruksförvaltningens utveckling intill tiden för lantbruksstyrelsens inträttande Anteckningar* (Stockholm, 1924), 25, Overland, *N H*, V, part 2, 1942

⁵⁹ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 6 8, Nielsen, *op cit* 318 319

⁶⁰ Linne, *Svenska resa*, 292 293 The English adventurer, Blackwell, Linné found doing less well on his estate at Allestad, *Wästgöta resa* 115 116

⁶¹ Juhlin Dannfelt, *op cit* 345 396, Odhner, *op cit*, II, 543-544

⁶² Cf e g the excellent description of John Collett's estate, Ulucwold, near Oslo, by Keilhau, in *N F L H*, VIII, 15 19

Malthus was told by a professor in Copenhagen that the reason for the backwardness of Norwegian agriculture, about 1799, was the absence of progressive proprietors who could lead the way But from what he saw in Norway, he concluded that this want is now in some degree supplied Many intelligent merchants, and well informed general officers, are at present engaged in farming *Op cit*, 132

⁶³ Schaumann, *op cit*, 29 30, Steen, in *N F L H*, VI, 211-213

⁶⁴ Åmark, Karl, *Spannmålshandel och spannmålspolitik i Sverige 1719-1830* (Stockholm, 1915), 185

⁶⁵ In these countries, too, import and export duties were levied on agricultural products In Sweden it was attempted to apply the navigation law of 1724 (*Product-plakaten*) to the grain trade, but frequent exceptions and suspensions had to be made Heckscher, *Ekonomi och historia*, 239 241

⁶⁶ Åmark, *op cit*, 181 184 and *passim*

How little it was understood that he who would sell must also buy is illustrated by the frequency with which the peasants were denounced for raising their standard of living Christian Sommerfelt wrote, 'Efterretninger angaaende Christians Amt,' in *Topographisk journal for Norge*, IV (1795 96), no 14, 93 If extravagance had not so much increased, and crop failures not occurred so often, the peasants would not need to fetch much more from the towns and other parts than salt, iron, and some fish'

⁶⁷ The temperance question is discussed more fully *post* II, 662 679

⁶⁸ Cf e g, P[ohl], A, 'Om brændevinsbrænden paa landet i Norge,' in *Isis* (Copenhagen), 1795, April June, 283 301, and Sommerfelt, O H, "Brev fra en nordmund, in *Mineva* (Copenhagen), I (1793), 322 334

⁶⁹ Åmark, *op cit*, 241 242, and 302-305, Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op cit*, 385-386, Odhner, *op cit*, I, 355 6

⁷⁰ Åmark, *op cit* 187-230, and 320 346

⁷¹ *Amtmændenes femårsberetninger*, 1836-1840, summary, 6, and 1840-45, summary, XIV, Hamilton, A, 'Upsala län,' in *K B's femårsberättelser*, 1861 65, 59 60, Steen, in *N F L H*, VII, 90 Mr Brace was much impressed by this "remarkable socialistic arrangement," Brace, Charles Loring, *The Norsefolk or, a visit to the homes of Norway and Sweden* (N Y, 1857), 396 397

⁷² Cf *ante*, I, 39 40

⁷³ Åmark, *op cit*, 184 185

⁷⁴ Text of the decree of April 23, 1845, in *Ny collegialtidende*, V (1845), 385 402, Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, 497-499, Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op cit*, II, 161-162

⁷⁵ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 8 10; Maar, V E, *Det danske landbrugs historie* (Copenhagen, 1912), 102 Maar quotes Christensen almost word for word without giving credit

⁷⁶ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier* II, 10

⁷⁷ Holm, in *D. R H*, V, 238, Linvald, in *D F H*, VI, 189, Cf also e. g.,

the text of Reverdil's memorial, edited by Edvard Holm, "Betænkning av Reverdil om landbotorholdene i Danmark (Sept. 20, 1767)," in *Danske magasin*, 5 R., V (1902), 1-7; and Oeder, G. C., *Hvorledes man kunde skaffe bonderne frihed og eiendom* (Copenhagen, 1769).

⁷⁸ *Om det syn paa kongemagt, folk og borgerlig frihed, der udviklede sig i den dansk-norske stat i midten af det 18. aarh.* (Universitets-program for April 1883) (Copenhagen, 1883) 132-133; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 317-318.

⁷⁹ *Cf. ante*, I, 63-64.

⁸⁰ Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 51; Wohlin, *op. cit.*, 151-223.

⁸¹ K. b.'s *femårsberättelser*, 1822, 21; *cf. also* Forsell, Carl al, *Statistik öfver Sverige* (Stockholm, 4th ed., 1844), 142.

⁸² Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 393-395; Malmström, *op. cit.*, IV, 420; [Örnskold], *Underdåmig berättelse*, 18-34.

⁸³ Odhner, *op. cit.*, II, 56-60.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 352-356.

⁸⁵ Överland, *N. H.*, V, part 2, 1946-1947; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 215-220.

CHAPTER III

¹ Holberg, Ludvig, *Holbergs levned fortalt af ham selv i tre latinske breve til en fornem herre* (tr. by Frederick Winkel Horn) (Copenhagen, 1897), 265.

² Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 160-163.

³ Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 352.

⁴ Fridericia, in *D. R. H.*, IV, 316 and 638.

⁵ *Cf. ante*, I, 26-28.

⁶ Fähræus, *S. H. V. D.*, VIII, 273-277; Grimberg, *S. F. U. Ö.*, IV, 289-319.

⁷ Castrén, in Sylwan, Otto, ed., *Svenska litteraturens historia* (Stockholm, 1929), I, 311-314.

⁸ Fähræus, in *S. H. V. D.*, VIII, 461 and *passim*; Holm in *D. R. H.*, IV, 111-127; Johnson, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 212-213; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, V, 382-383 and *passim*.

⁹ Quoted by Grimberg, *S. F. U. Ö.*, V, 503.

¹⁰ Grimberg, *S. F. U. Ö.*, V, 503; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 138.

¹¹ Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 325-327; Helveg, Ludvig, Nicolaus, *Den danske kirkes historie efter reformationen* (Copenhagen, 2nd ed., 1857-1883), II, 14-16, 49-55, and *passim*; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 128-131; Källström, Arvid, *Bidrag till den svenska pietismens historia. 1: Pietismen före konventikelplakatet (1726)* (Stockholm, 1894), 28-31, 203, and *passim*; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 350-352; Petersen, Niels Matthias, *Den danske litteraturs historie* (Copenhagen, 1853-1864), IV, 56; Rönning, F., *Rationalismens tidsalder, 1750-1890* (Copenhagen, 1886-1896), I, 44-62; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 357-358; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 318-330; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 329-338; Thrapp, Daniel, *Bidrag til den norske kirkes historie i det nittende aarhundrede* (Oslo, 1890), II, 313ff.; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 2-4, 130-141, and *passim*.

¹² Quoted by Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 337-8.

¹³ *Cf.*, the text of *Præsteståndets den 23 september 1723 ingifne underdåmig memorial angående religionsvården*, in *Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift*, I (1900), 284-290.

¹⁴ Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 89-92; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 119-120; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 136-138.

¹⁵ Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 128-131; For good accounts of the *Pleiades*, *cf.*, Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 56-59, and Överland, O. A., *N. H.*, V, part I, 1042-1052.

¹⁶ Brandes, Georg, *Ludvig Holberg [Samlede skrifter]*, I (Copenhagen, 1899-1905), 146-150; Petersen, *Den d. litteraturs hist.*, IV, 56.

¹⁷ Bull, Francis, *Norsk litteraturhistorie* (Oslo, 1924-1929), II, 386-389.

¹⁸ Document in *Hist. meddelelser om København*, I R., V (1915-1916) 479-480; *cf. also*, Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 142-159.

¹⁹ *Cf.* the excellent characterization of Thomas von Westen by Sverre Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, 57-67; *cf. also* Överland, *N. H.*, V, part I, 1050-1062.

²⁰ Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 327; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 124.

- ²¹ Hansen, P., *Illustreret dansk litteratur historie* (Copenhagen, 2nd ed., 1903), II, 121; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 181-182; Koch, L., *Oplysningsstuden i den danske Kirke* (Copenhagen, 1914) *passim*; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 324-326; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 124-127.
- ²² Thrapp, *op. cit.*, II, 313.
- ²³ Elster, Kristian, d.y., *Norsk litteratur historie* (Oslo, 1922-1924), I, 420; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 6-9.
- ²⁴ Cf. *post*, II, 591-593.
- ²⁵ Carøe, K., *Studier til dansk medicinhistorie*, 141-171.
- ²⁶ Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 376.
- ²⁷ Belfrage, Sixten, *Sällistiska studier över sammansättningarna i sjuttonhundratalets svenska litteratur* (Lund, 1920), 127-147; Rönning, *op. cit.*, I, 59; Vedel, Valdemar, *Studier over guldalderen i dansk digtning* (Copenhagen, 1890), 39-40.
- ²⁸ Struensee, the very personification of that revolt, had been reared in a pictistic home. Koch, *op. cit.*, 25.
- ²⁹ Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 370-374; cf., e. g., Pontoppidan, Erik, *Menoza* (Copenhagen, 1742-1743).
- ³⁰ Cf. *ante*, I, 92.
- ³¹ Andersen, Vilhelm, *Tider og typer af dansk aands historie. 1. række: humanisme* (Copenhagen, 1907-1916), II, 23, and 6-24; cf. also, Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 288-289; Paludan, J., "Kristian Falster," in *Dansk biografisk lexikon* (Brickat, ed.), V, 72-75.
- ³² Brandes, Ludvig Holberg (*Saml. skr.*, I), 56-58; Holberg, *Levned, passim*; Lassen, H., *Afhandlinger til litteraturhistorien* (Oslo, 1877), 35-40; Mortensen, Karl, *Dansk litteraturhistorie* (Copenhagen, 4th ed., 1918), 47-50.
- ³³ Holberg, Ludvig, *Introduction till de fornemste europæiske rigers historier, fortsat indtil disse sidste tider . . .*, (Copenhagen, 1711); also *Natur- og folkeret*, written 1715-1716.
- ³⁴ E. g., the passage on education in Holberg's *Levned*, 264-5.
- ³⁵ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 271-279; Hansen, *Ill. d. litt. hist.*, II, 3-114; Jaeger, Henrik, *Illustreret norsk litteraturhistorie* (Copenhagen, 1896), I, 270-278.
- ³⁶ Cf., Brandes, Ludvig Holberg (*Saml. skr.*, I), 59-65; Hansen, *Ill. d. litt. hist.*, II, 35-48; Holberg, Ludvig, *En sandfærdig ny vise om Peder Paars som gjorde en reyse fra Callundborg til Aars, skreven til lægedom, tröst og husvælelse for alle got folk som lide kaars og modgang her i verden af Hans Mickelsen, borger og indvæner i Callundborg . . .* (Copenhagen, 1719); Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, 296-307; Mortensen, *op. cit.*, 53-54.
- ³⁷ Andersen, Vilhelm, *Kritik, sprog, og litteratur* (Copenhagen, 1914), 132-163; Brandes, Ludvig Holberg (*Saml. skr.*, I), 66-73; Hansen, *Ill. d. litt. hist.*, II, 29-30; Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, 310-328; Mortensen, *op. cit.*, 54-55.
- ³⁸ Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 78; Holberg, *Niels Klims underjordiske reise* (Copenhagen, 1st ed., 1742); Holberg, *Levned, passim*; Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, 336-349.
- ³⁹ Holberg, *Levned*, 52.
- ⁴⁰ Aall occupies the chair of philosophy at the university of Oslo. Cf. his treatise "Filosofien i Norden," in *Edda*, V (1916), 178-183. Cf., also, Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 335-336.
- ⁴¹ Quoted by Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, 181.
- ⁴² Holberg, *Levned*, 273.
- ⁴³ He wrote in *Holberg's Levned*, 177: "The moods by which from time to time my mind is dominated are joy, sorrow, fear, boldness, apathy, ardor, zeal, equanimity, all depending upon which part of my body happens to be attacked by the evil juices to which it is a victim. Thus, when they at one time had settled about the heart, I was carried away by an ardor for reform and did battle against all mankind; but soon afterward, when the evil juices had moved elsewhere, no one could possibly have been more tolerant than I. Consequently, whenever I am seized by an eagerness for reform, I postpone the battle with mankind, having learned that it is not the world but myself with whom I must wage war, inasmuch as that zeal may be driven away by means of laxative pills; for when illness is past, I immediately view mankind in a different light, and the world appears to me to be quite transformed."
- ⁴⁴ Holberg, *Niels Klim*, chapter II.
- ⁴⁵ *Almindelig kirke historie* (Copenhagen, 1738).

⁴⁰ *Niels Klim*, chapter III. Except for this restriction the Potuans enjoyed complete freedom of religion. Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 140; Hansen, *Ill. d. litt. hist.*, II, 115.

⁴⁷ *Levnede*, 243.

⁴⁸ Överland, *N. H.*, V, part 2, 1075; Ronning, *op. cit.*, I, 17-44.

⁴⁹ On Grundtvig, *cf. post*, II, 332-339.

⁵⁰ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 270 and 336; Hansen, *Ill. d. litt. hist.*, II, 111; Lassen, *Afhandlinger . . .*, 7-17.

⁵¹ *Niels Klim*, chapter III.

⁵² While passing through Rotterdam on one of his journeys, Holberg was so much aroused by the irreverence of a group of small boys whom he saw throwing stones at the statue of Erasmus, that his angel found its way many years later into his rather meager autobiography. *Cf. Levnede*, 54.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 264-5; Lassen, *op. cit.*, 17-27.

⁵⁴ *Niels Klim*, chapter IV.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, chapters VII and VIII.

⁵⁶ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, 180-181; Elster, *op. cit.*, 344; Holberg, *Forsvarsskrift for quindekjonnet*, lines 777-780, and 421-425, and *passim*.

⁵⁷ *Niels Klim*, chapter II.

⁵⁸ *Cf.*, e. g., Jolinsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 1, 198.

⁵⁹ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 292-295; Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 372; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 174, 182-3.

⁶⁰ Sneedorff, Frederik S., *Samlede skrifter* (Copenhagen, 1797-98, IV vols. in V), I, XXIII-XXXIV. His father, J. S. Sneedorff, had been a warm admirer of Holberg.

⁶¹ Schuck och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 324-326.

⁶² *Cf. ante*, I, 91.

⁶³ Aall, Anathon, *Filosofien i Norden: til oplysning om den nyere tænknings og videnskaps historie i Sverige, Finland, Danmark og Norge* (Oslo, 1919), 7; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 327; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 160-163, and 352-355.

⁶⁴ Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 163-166. Rydelius' philosophical views are most conveniently presented in a short, readable work, *Scientiae philosophiae fundamentales*, published in 1733.

⁶⁵ Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 213-215.

⁶⁶ Böök, Fredrik, "Dalín," in *Stridsmän och sångare. Svenska essayer* (Stockholm, 1922), 47-64; C—m., "Olof von Dalin," in *Biographiske lexicon öfver namnkunniga svenska män*, IV 39-49; Horn, Frederick Winkel, *History of the literature of the Scandinavian North . . .* (Chicago, 1884), 345-353; Lindgren, Hellen, *Sveriges vittra storhetstid, 1730-1850* (Stockholm, 1895), part 1, 46-65; Schück, Henrik och Warburg, Karl, *Huvuddragen av Sveriges litteratur* (Stockholm, 1917), II, 87-108; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *op. cit.*, I, 330.

⁶⁷ C—m., "Olof von Dalin," *loc. cit.*, 41, where Bishop Celsius is quoted.

⁶⁸ Levertin, Oscar, *Svenska gestalter* (Stockholm, 1903), 6-7.

⁶⁹ *Then swänska argus*, I (1732), no. 2.

⁷⁰ Grimberg, S. F. U. Ö., VI, 215-249; Levertin, *Svenska gestalter*, 6-18; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 330-339.

⁷¹ Erdman, Nils, *Gustaf III: de första bladen i hans lifs historia* (Stockholm, 1907), 32-33 and *passim*; Tessin, Karl Gustaf, *Skrifter* (Upsala, 1882-1883), 11-96.

⁷² Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 185-191; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 241-243, 254-62, and 310-317; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 360; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

CHAPTER IV

¹ Vedel, Valdemar, *Studier over guldalderen i dansk digtning*, 18-19.

² Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 208-215; Usher, *op. cit.*, 338-340.

³ Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 105, 170-172.

⁴ Grimberg, S. F. U. Ö., VI, 288-292; Lamm, *Swedenborg*, 23-24; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 346.

⁵ Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 346-7; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 375; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 122-124, and 299-300.

The Copenhagen society refused to admit Ludvig Holberg at first, but soon elected him an honorary member. He never attended its meetings, however, though he did submit a couple of papers. Cf. Överland, *N. H.*, V, part 3, 1158.

⁶ Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 306-7. The beginnings of agricultural chemistry are usually dated from 1840, when Liebig read his paper before the *Royal Society*.

⁷ The first chemical laboratory in Sweden was also founded by a physician, Urban Hjärne, Cf. *ante*, I, 91.

⁸ Levertin, Oscar, *Carl von Linné: några kapitel ur ett oafslutadt arbete* (Stockholm, 1906), *passim*; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 51-67; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, 304-6; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 346-8; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 176-177.

⁹ Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 374.

¹⁰ Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 346.

¹¹ Cf. *post*, I, 364-366, where this is discussed more fully.

¹² Scandinavian economic theory in the eighteenth century is discussed more fully *ante*, I, 16-20.

¹³ The best known is probably the Arnemagnean collection of Icelandic manuscripts in Copenhagen, assembled by the Icelander Arne Magnusson.

¹⁴ Holberg, *Levned*, 276; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 349-350.

¹⁵ Holberg, *Levned*, 276: "Most historical works contain nothing but a pish-posh of military exploits, and for that reason every pen-pusher believes that he can easily qualify as an historian, since nothing is easier than to relate events straightforwardly without criticism." Cf., also Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 364.

¹⁶ Lagerbring, *Svea rikets historia* (Stockholm, 1769 ff.); How well the work of Lagerbring has stood the test of time may be learned by reading Arthur Stille's memorial address, *Sven Lagerbring*, (*Lunds universitets årsskrift*, n. f., afd. 1, bd. 3, nr. 2) (Lund, 1908), 14 pp.

¹⁷ Bull, *op. cit.*, II, 402-405; Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 460-465.

¹⁸ Hansen, *op. cit.*, II, 138-139; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 113-117, 302-303.

¹⁹ Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 274; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 285-6; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 83-84.

²⁰ For a discussion of the evolution of the Norwegian language, cf. *post*, II, 466-469.

²¹ Andersen, *Tider og typer*, I, 128-136; Bruun, Christian Walther, *Gunde Rosenkrantz. Et bidrag til Danmarks historie under Frederik den tredje* (Copenhagen, 1885), 48-73; Överland, *op. cit.*, V, part 2, 1109-1110; Petersen, *Den danske litteraturs historie*, IV, 72-79; Schwanenflugel, H., "Language and Literature," in Weitemeyer, H., ed., *Denmark; its history and topography, language, literature, fine-arts, social life and finance* (London, 1891), 137-8; Wessen, Elias, "Om det tyska inflytandet på svenskt språk under medeltiden," in *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri*, V, (1929), 265-280.

²² Tegnér, Es., "Om språk och nationalitet," in *Svensk tidskrift för litteratur, politik och ekonomi*, V, (1874), 144. Tegnér was the outstanding authority on the Swedish language in the nineteenth century.

²³ *Den patriotiske tilskuer*, VI, (Dec. 30, 1763), 932-933.

²⁴ Fay, Bernard, "Learned societies in Europe and America in the eighteenth century," in *Am. hist. rev.*, XXXVII (Jan., 1932), 263.

²⁵ *Then swänska argus*, I (1733), no. XLV. Of this eulogy Sylwan declares that no Swede prior to Dalin could honestly have written it, for it was only in his hands that the Swedish language came to deserve it. Cf., Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 332.

²⁶ Cf. *post*, I, 205.

²⁷ Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 225-6.

²⁸ *Den patriotiske tilskuer*, I (1761), no. 7, 51.

²⁹ Aakjær, in *D. F. H.*, I, 88-90; Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 167-168, 174; Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 416; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 27n; Kroman, K., "Eilschow," in *Dansk biogr. lexikon* (Bricka, ed.), IV, 465-471; Petersen, *Den danske litteraturs historie*, 272ff.; Rönning, *op. cit.*, I, 97-109; Sneedorff, Fr., *Samlede skrifter*, II, 268-271.

³⁰ This appears to have been in 1730. The document enjoined the students to refrain from "untimely shooting and shouting." Cf., Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 41.

³¹ *Then swänska argus*, I (1733), No. XLV.

³² It is worth noting, however, that Dalin's friend, Anders von Hölstén, a thoroughgoing modernist, opposed it on the ground that no language can experience healthy development, which severs itself from others. Cf., Schuck och Warburg, *III. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 40.

³³ *Den patriotiske tilskuer*, II (No. 79, Oct. 19, 1761), 657-664; Schuck och Warburg, *III. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 39-42; Schuck och Warburg, *Huvuddragene*, II, 82-83; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, I, 300, and 308-309; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 351-352; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 40.

³⁴ Bernstorff, J. H. E., *Correspondance entre le comte Johan Hartwig Ernst Bernstorff et le duc de Choiseul, 1757-1766* (Copenhagen, 1871), p. x.

³⁵ Eaton, J. W., "The French influence in Denmark in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries," in *Germanic review*, VI, (Oct., 1931), 321-362; Holm, in *D. R. H.*, V, 267; cf., also, Lamm, Martin, *Upplysningstidens romantik, Den mystiskt sentimentala strömningen i svensk litteratur* (Stockholm, 1918-19), 237-253; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 295-297; Schuck och Warburg, *III. sv. litteraturhist.*, III, 185-191; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 414; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 166.

³⁶ Published at Sorø, in Denmark, where Sneedorff was teaching at the academy founded by Holbægt. It appeared weekly, 1761-1763.

³⁷ Lindgren, *op. cit.*, part 1, 80-83; Schuck och Warburg, *Huvuddragene*, II, 15-31.

³⁸ For an excellent account of the English influence in Oslo, cf., Daac, Ludvig, *Det gamle Christiania* (Oslo, 1871), 151-164. Extracts from the diary of Frederik Stoud (1790), are quoted by Daac, in the third edition of the same work, 250-251.

³⁹ The Danish pioneer economist, Lütken, *Økonomiske tanker*, I, part 1, in the preface and on p. 25, presents a hesitating and apologetic demand for freedom of expression. Cf., also, Beer, Max, *Socialismens historie* (Stockholm, 1926), II, 518.

⁴⁰ Cf., Becker, Carl, *The heavenly city of the eighteenth century philosophers* (New Haven, 1932).

⁴¹ Carøe, K., "En aabenbaring og dens følger," in *Historiske meddelelser om København*, I R., VII (1919-20), 182-196; Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 2, 325; Koch, L., *Oplysningstiden i den danske kirke* (Copenhagen, 1914), 75-76, 97-99, 327; Odhner, *op. cit.*, I, 605-606.

⁴² Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 267-8; Duhre, *op. cit.*, 2-3; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VI, 157; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 356.

⁴³ This last is especially well demonstrated for Denmark-Norway by Edvard Holm, *Om det syn*, 23-29, and *passim*; cf., also the article on Henrik Stampe (1713-1789) in *Dansk biografisk lexikon* (Bricka, ed.), XVI, 273-282; and Boye, Johannes, *Statens ven* (Copenhagen, 1792-1814), II, 29-30 and *passim*.

⁴⁴ An interesting illustration is the invitation issued in 1791 by a number of persons in Norway to form a Corresponding Topographical Society for Norway. Cf., *Topographiske journal for Norge*, I (1791-2), no. 1, 1-13.

⁴⁵ *Den patriotiske tilskuer*, II (no. 79, Oct. 19, 1761), 659.

⁴⁶ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 52.

⁴⁷ Andersen, *op. cit.*, II, 268-270; Bull, *Norsk litteraturhistorie*, II, 414-416; Kraft, Jens, *Kort fortælling af de vilde folk til oplysning af det menneskelige oprindelse og fremgang i almindelighed* (Copenhagen, 1760); Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 283-285.

⁴⁸ Lassen, *Afhandlinger til litteraturhistorien*, 41-44.

⁴⁹ *Den patriotiske tilskuer*, I (1761), 412.

⁵⁰ Cf., e. g., the explanation of the tale of Jonah and the whale proffered by the natural scientist, Bishop Johan Ernst Gunnerus, *Bevis, at brugden, efter al formodning, har været den fisk, som opløgede profeten Jonas*, (Kongl. Videnskabs Selskabs skrifter, IV (Copenhagen, 1768), pp. 14-37.

⁵¹ Bull, *Norsk litteraturhist.*, II, 389-390.

⁵² Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 334-335; Tessin, *Skrifter*, 115-129.

⁵³ Smith, Laurids, *Anledning til den naturlige religion* (Trondhjem, 1784).

⁵⁴ Cf., his *Menoza*, written in reply to Holberg's *Niels Klim*.

⁵⁵ Ehnmark, Eloy, *Studier i svensk realism; 1700-talstraditionen och Fredrik Cederborgh* (Upsala, 1930), 91-93.

⁵⁶ Buch, Leopold von, *Reise durch Norwegen und Lappland* (Berlin, 1810), 159-163; Bull, *op. cit.*, II, 410-411; Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 420-426; Koch, *op. cit.*, 336; Norrie, Gordon, "En landeplage—fnat—for 100 aar siden," in *Ugeskrift for læger*,

1900, 305-306; Petersen, Jul., *Koppemokulationen i det attende aarhundrede, særlig i Danmark-Norge* (Copenhagen, 1891); Schauman, *op. cit.*, 29-35.

⁶⁷ Cf., e. g., Smith, *op. cit.*, 58; and Tieschow, Nils, *Kort udkast til kundskab om mennesket eller anthropologie* . . . (Copenhagen, 1803), part 1, 233-239.

⁶⁸ Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 318; Hansen, *Ill. d. lit. hist.*, 244-245; Koch, *op. cit.*, 90-91; Stavenow, in *S. H. D.*, X, 117.

⁶⁹ Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 314-317.

⁶⁰ Cf., e. g., Andreas Lundhoff's *Den danske spectators filosofiske spectator*, described by Andersen, *Tider og typer*, II, 177, and 184-186.

⁶¹ Belfrage, *op. cit.*, shows how Swedish style was affected by French classicism down to the very words and phrases. Cf., also, Grimberg, *S. F. U. Ö.*, VII, 147-152; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 295-297; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 397-398; Wrangel, *op. cit.*, 265-287.

⁶² Book, Fredrik, *Essayer och kritiker* (Stockholm, 1913-1919), IV, 1-30; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 376-378.

⁶³ Kellgren, Johan Henrik, *Samlade skrifter* (Nils von Rosenstein, ed.) (Stockholm, 1811), II, 187-191.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 79-82.

⁶⁵ Grimberg, *S. F. U. Ö.*, VII, 154-158; Horn, *op. cit.*, 356-359; Lagus, Wilhelm, *Skalden Johan Henrik Kellgrens finska lefnadsminnen* (Helsingfors, 1884), *passim*; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 174-189; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 419-424.

⁶⁶ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 470-515; Hansen, *Ill. d. lit. hist.*, II, 420-452; Horn, *op. cit.*, 217-221; Jaeger, *Ill. n. lit. hist.*, I, 444-485; Jorgensen, Theodore, *History of Norwegian literature* (N. Y., 1933), 170-179; Lindbæk, Sofie Aubert, *Fra det norske selskabs kreds: et udvalg vers og breve* (Oslo, 1913), *passim*; Rönning, *op. cit.*, II, *passim*.

⁶⁷ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 431-440; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 295-299; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 450-455; Vedel, Valdemar, *Svensk romantik. En udsigt over udviklingen fra den gustavianske rococo til den borgeitlige liberalisme* (Copenhagen, 1894), 104-109.

⁶⁸ Levertin, *Svenska gestalter*, 1-45; Lindgren, *op. cit.*, 66-80; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 109-122; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 373-375.

⁶⁹ Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 122-127; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 376-382.

⁷⁰ Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 157-169; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 455-458.

⁷¹ Horn, *op. cit.*, 359-364; Schück, Henrik, *Uti gamla papper*, ser. 7, 103-105; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 138-156; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 400-410; Vedel, *Svensk romantik*, 16-28.

⁷² *Saml. skr.*, II, 195-199.

⁷³ Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 189-195; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 491-497.

⁷⁴ Böök, *Svidsmän och sångare*, 165-172; Frunck, Gudmund Leonard Daniel, *Bidrag till kunnedom om nya skolans förberedelser och första utveckling (till år 1811)* (Stockholm, 1889), 238; Geijer, Erik Gustav, *Thorild, in Samlade skrifter* (Stockholm, 1875 ed.), II, 165-229; Horn, *op. cit.*, 367-369; Schück och Warburg, *Ill. sv. lit. hist.*, II, part 1, 401-425; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., I, 470-482; Vedel, *Svensk romantik*, 44-65.

⁷⁵ Horn, *op. cit.*, 366-367; Lindgren, *op. cit.*, II, 90-112; Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 219-233; Sylwan, in Sylwan, ed., *Sv. lit. hist.*, I, 483-489.

⁷⁶ Elster, *op. cit.*, I, 438-440; Hansen, *Ill. d. lit. hist.*, II, 453-489; Horn, *op. cit.*, 211-217; Magon, Leopold, *Ein Jahrhundert geistiger und literarischer beziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Skandinavien 1750-1850* (Dortmund, 1926), I, *passim*; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 303-304.

⁷⁷ Cf. *post*, II, 446.

⁷⁸ Elster, *op. cit.*, 444-455; Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, 397-418; Jørgensen, *op. cit.*, 168-169.

⁷⁹ Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Ideen zur philosophie der geschichte der menschheit (Herders werke, vierter teil, drittes abtheilung, in Deutsche national-literatur, Joseph*

Kurschner, ed., LXXVII, *erste abteilung, dritter teil* (Stuttgart, n. d.), 18th book, chapter 4, 754-755.

⁸⁰ Sneedorff, Fr., *Samlede skrifter*, I, 195. Cf., also, Lidén, Arne, *Den norska strömmingen i svensk litteratur under 1800-talet* (Upsala, 1926), 1-5, and *passim*.

⁸¹ Lamm, *Upplysningsidens romantik*, I, 263.

⁸² *Ibid.*, I, 263-318. Cf. also, Blanck, Anton, *Den nordiska renässansen i sjuttonhundratalets litteratur; en undersökning av den "gotiska" poesiens allmänna och inhemska förutsättningar* (Stockholm, 1911), 309-427.

⁸³ *Op. cit.*, chapter V, 757. Cf. also, Benson, Adolph, *The old Norse element in Swedish romanticism* (New York, 1914), 99-100.

⁸⁴ Hustvedt, S. B., *Ballad criticism in Scandinavia and Great Britain in the eighteenth century* (New York, 1916).

⁸⁵ Blanck, *op. cit.*, 201-217; Vedel, *Studier over guldalderen i dansk digtning*, 82-91.

⁸⁶ Böök, *Stridsmän och sångare, 165-172; Konung Gustaf III's skrifter, I: Dramatiska skrifter, förra delen* (Stockholm, 1857), *Gustaf Vasa*, 1-50; Levertin, Oscar, *Gustaf III som dramatisk författare* (Stockholm, 1894); Lindgren, *op. cit.*, part 2, 113-188.

⁸⁷ Elster, *op. cit.*, 529-547; Jörgensen, *op. cit.*, 167, and 174-176; Lassen, *Afhandlingar til litteraturhistorien*, 153-193.

⁸⁸ Boye, *op. cit.*, I (1792), 213-214. The Swedish poet Kellgren, in the same year and with obvious reference to the French Revolution, sounded exactly the same warning. Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 191-192.

CHAPTER V

¹ Gauffin, Axel, in Romdahl, Axel L. och Roosval, Johnny, *Svensk konsthistoria* (Stockholm, 1913), 375.

² Schnitler, Carl W., in Aars, Harald, *et al.*, *Norsk kunsthistorie* (Oslo, 1927), II, 135.

³ Roosval, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 66-69.

⁴ Fett, Harry, in Aars, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 2-7; Gauffin, Axel, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 66-68, and *passim*; Müller, in D. F. H., V, 387-390, and VI, 311-313; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VI, 367-368, and *passim*.

⁵ Gauffin, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 375.

⁶ Curman, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 567 ff.; Fett, in Aars *et al.*, *op. cit.*, 7-56; Holm, in D. R. H., V, 190-193, 251-255; Müller, in D. F. H., V, 393-402, and VI, 313-318; Stavenow, in S. H. V. D., IX, 125 and 322-323, X, 111; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VI, 372-374.

⁷ Göthe, Georg, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 450. Swedish sculpture is well discussed in this volume, pp. 430-452, and Sergel in Nyblom, Carl Rupert, *Estetiska Studier* (Upsala, 1884), I, 103-158.

⁸ Andersen, in D. F. H., VI, 496-497. Cf., also, Müller, in D. F. H., VI, 318-320.

⁹ Schnitler, C. W., in Aars *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 71-134.

¹⁰ Andersen, in D. F. H., VI, 320; Gauffin, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 381-386; Stavenow, in S. H. V. D., IX, 321-322.

¹¹ Gauffin, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 393-396, and 406-410; Schnitler, in Aars *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 183-186.

¹² Andersen, in D. F. H., VI, 320-324; Gauffin, in Romdahl och Roosval, *op. cit.*, 397-425; Müller, in D. F. H., VI, 311-313, and 320-324; Schnitler, in Aars *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 186-200.

¹³ Grevenor, in Aars, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 203-226; Johnsen, in N. H., V, part 2, 289; Müller, in D. F. H., VI, 325-326.

¹⁴ Hammerich, Angul, *Dansk musikhistorie indtil ca. 1700* (Copenhagen, 1921); Lassen, *Afhandlingar til litteraturhistorien*, 59-61; Morales, O. och Norlind, Tobias, *Kungliga musikalska akademien 1771-1921* (Stockholm, 1921), *passim*; Norlind, Tobias, *Allmänt musiklexikon* (Stockholm, 2nd ed., 1927), *passim*; Norlind, Tobias, *Svensk musikhistoria* (Stockholm, 2nd ed., 1918), *passim*; Ravn, V. C., *Konserter og musikalske selskaber i Danmark. (Festskrift i anledning af Musikforeningens halvhundrede-årsdag)* (Copenhagen, 1886); Sandvik, O. M. og Schjelderup, G., *Norges*

musikhistorie (Oslo, 1921), I, *passim*, Steen, in *N F L H*, VII, 103, Vretblad, P, *Konsertlivet i Stockholm under 1700 talet* (Stockholm, 1918)

¹³ Cf chapter II

¹⁴ For an excellent novel describing this activity, cf, Gulbrandsen, *Tyggve, Og bakom synges skogene* (Oslo, 1933), English translation, *Beyond sing the woods* (New York, 1936)

¹⁷ Norlind, *Svenska allmogens lif*, 199-206, Schnitler, in Aars, *et al*, *op cit*, II, 127-130, Uhrskov, Anders, *Dagligt liv* (Copenhagen, 1924), *passim*, Visted, Kristofer, *Voi gamle bondekulturi* (Oslo, 1908), 106-145

¹⁸ Norlind, *Svenska allmogens lif*, 206-220 Translation by Theresse Arneson Hovde from Kallfeldt, *Fridolins lustgård och dalmålningar på rim* (Stockholm, 18th printing, 1920), 94-97

¹⁹ Kohrt, *Noisik bondevisning*, 217, Johnsen, in *N H*, V, part 2, 322-324, Schnitler, in Aars, *et al*, *op cit*, II, 135-143, and Steen in *N F L H*, VI, 367-378, *passim*

²⁰ Norlind, *Svenska allmogens lif*, 220-225

²¹ Schnitler, in Aars, *et al*, *op cit*, II, 172-180

²² Kohrt, *Noisik bondevisning*, 218-219, Norlind, *Svenska allmogens lif*, 680-682 Bjornstjerne Bjornson has written a description of a Norwegian *spillemand*, in *Arne*, which, however, hardly does justice to the class Cf, also, Steen, in *N F L H*, VI, 352-353, Uhrskov, Anders, *Hoidt* (Copenhagen, 1924), *passim*

CHAPTER VI

¹ John Masfield, *A Conversation*

² Lvertin, *Svenska gestalter*, 18

³ Edler, P J, "Striden om otralse mans ratt till civila ambeten, 1719-1723," in *Hist tidskr*, (S), XXXV (1915), 127-167, *Handlingar angående studen vid 1723 års riksdag om oftralse mans ratt till civila ambeten* (*Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia*, XXXIII, part 5) (Stockholm, 1852), 338-432, Hildebrand, Emil, *Svenska statsförfattningens historiska utveckling från äldsta tid till våra dagar* (Stockholm, 1896), 464, Malmstrom, *op cit*, I, 407-431

⁴ Cf, Fahlbeck, Pontus Erland, *La constitution suédoise et le parlementarisme moderne* (Paris, 1905), 33-45, on Swedish constitutional development between 1680 and 1809, Hildebrand, *Sv. statsförf*, 442-460; Stavenow, in *S H V D*, IX, 47.

⁵ Valentini, Ilugo Mauritz, *Frilhetstudens riddarhus. Några bidrag till dess kända-teisutsk* (Stockholm, 1915), 1-9

⁶ Ekegård, *op cit*, 294-295, and 136-139

⁷ Olsson, Ragnai, *Bondeståndet under den tidigare frilhetstuden* (Lund, 1926), 46-55

⁸ *Ibid*, 88-108, Ekegård, *op cit*, 138-139, Grimberg, *S F U. O*, V, 522-529, Valentini, *op cit*, *passim*

⁹ Malmstrom, *op cit*, I, 351-352, 367-371, 377-383, and 386-390.

¹⁰ Grauers, Sv, *Arvid Bernhard Horn Biografisk studie i 1664-1713* (Stockholm, 1920), Svedelius, W E, *Minne af kanslipresidenten greve Arvid Bernhard Horn* (*Sv akad handl i från år 1796* D 54 [1879], 131-520, and 55 [1879], 1-410)

¹¹ Malmstrom, *op cit*, II, 108-353

¹² Valentini, *op cit*, 81

¹³ Malmstrom, *op cit*, II, 321-323.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, V, 252-253

¹⁵ Cf the Swedish official report by Boneauschold, Gustaf, *Relationer om de svenske indvortes uueligheden i aaret 1743* (Copenhagen, 1743?) This is a Danish translation, and is itself evidence of the interest with which the event was viewed in Denmark.

¹⁶ Beskow, B Von, *Gustaf III såsom konung och mannska* (Stockholm, 1860-61), I, 72, Malmstrom, *op cit*, III, 358-362, and IV, 146-247.

¹⁷ Malmstrom, *op cit*, V, 202

¹⁸ *Ibid*, V, 175-452

¹⁹ Hallendorff, *Rikens stauders bank*, 1719-66 (*Sveriges riksbank*, II), 281

²⁰ Malmstrom, *op cit*, VI, 1-97

²¹ Malinström, *op. cit.*, VI, 210-378. On the Russo-Danish alliance to preserve the Swedish democratic constitution, *cf.*, Barthélemy, Edouard, *Histoire des relations de la France et du Danemarck sous le ministère du comte de Bernstorff*, 1751-1770 (Copenhagen, 1887), 154-248, and 268-278; Bernstorff, J. H. E., *Correspondance ministerielle*, 1751-1770, publiée par P. Vedel (Copenhagen, 1882), *passim*, Holm, in D. R. H., V, 203-227, 296-318, 339-343, and 385-386; Johnsen, in N. H., V, part 2, 118-122; Lindvald, in D. F. H., VI, 21-22, 96, and 103-106; Stavenow in S. H. V. D., X, 7-11; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VI, 142-144, and 150-151.

²² Stavenow, Ludvig, *Några ord om frihetstidens allmänna betydelse och plats i det svenska folkets historia* (Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift, III, 1897) (Gothenburg, 1897), 5.

²³ Quoted by Hildebrand, *Sv. statsforh.*, 471.

²⁴ Malmström, *op. cit.*, VI, 405-413; Odhner, *op. cit.*, I, 169-170.

²⁵ Beskow, *op. cit.*, I, 139; Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 510-524.

²⁶ On the economic phase of the problem, *cf. ante*, I, 82. On the social phase, *cf. post*, II, 662-679.

²⁷ Bergman, Johan, *Nyktterhetsrörelsens världshistoria* (Stockholm, 1926), II, 141.

²⁸ Grimberg, *op. cit.*, VII, 402; *cf. also*, Stavenow, in S. H. V. D., X, 181.

²⁹ Koht, *Norsk bondereising* presents the best interpretation of this peasant movement; but see also his articles and works: "Bonde mot borgar i nynorsk historie," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 5 R., I (1912), 29-54; *Bondestrid, smaa segner og uppskrifter fraa Nordmøre* (Oslo, 1906); and "Prisar og politikk i norsk historie," in *Samtiden* (1913). See also Sverre Steen's volumes in N. F. L. H., VI, and VII, *passim*.

³⁰ Höverstad, Torstein, *Norsk skulesaga 1739-1827* (Oslo, 1918), *passim*; Koht, *Norsk bondereising*, 271-273.

³¹ Quoted by Johnsen, in N. H., V, part I, 187.

³² Johnson, *Norges bønder*, 305-6; Koht, *Norsk bondereising*, 287-304; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VI, 390-409.

³³ Daae, *Det gamle Christiania*, 217-221; Nielsen, Yngvar, "Gustav III's norske politik," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 2 R., I (1877), 5, 263, 305 and *passim*; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VII, 51-54.

³⁴ Holm, in D. R. H., V, 387-388; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VII, 64.

³⁵ Johnsen, in N. H., V, part 2, 154-156; Koht, *Norsk bondereising*, 305-334. Överland, N. H., V, part 2, 1553-1573; Steen, in N. F. L. H., VII, 110-124; Svedrup, Georg, *Lofthusbevegelsen* (Oslo, 1917); Wergeland, Henrik, *Christian Jensen Lofthus* [Samlede skrifter (Oslo, 1857), VIII, 149-311].

³⁶ Daae, *Det gamle Christiania*, first edition, 215-216.

³⁷ Godwin, Mary, *Letters written during a short residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (London, 1796), 160-161.

³⁸ Daae, *Det gamle Christiania*, 216. Translation by Therese Arneson Hovde.

³⁹ Steen, in N. F. L. H., 165-167.

⁴⁰ Henrik Wergeland, the intellectual champion of the popular peasant movement in the 1830's apothecized Lofthus in his biography, and the peasant poet, A. O. Vinje, relates in the epic, *Storegut*, how the officials and tax-collectors provoked the Lofthus rising by their greed, their cruelty, their drunkenness, and their annoyance of pretty girls: *Skrifter i samling* (Oslo, 1916), V, 286.

⁴¹ Memorial of State Councillor Ryberg to Christian VII, in reply to Struensee's inquiry concerning measures most likely to promote trade, quoted by Nathanson, *Udførligere oplysninger, etc.*, 11-12.

⁴² Holm, in D. R. H., V, 324-5; Rahbek, Kaud Lynhø, *Erindringer af mit liv* (Copenhagen, 1823-1829), I, 96; Reddaway, W. L., "Struensee and the fall of Bernstorff," in *English hist. rev.*, XXVII (April, 1912), 274-286.

⁴³ Nathanson, *Danmarks handel, etc.*, I, 68-74.

⁴⁴ Holm, in D. R. H., V, 685. *Cf.*, also, Holm's *Danmark-Norges udenrigske historie under den franske revolution og Napoleons krige fra 1791 til 1807* (Copenhagen, 1875), I, 20-25.

⁴⁵ Sneedorff, Fr., *Samlede skrifter*, III & IV.

⁴⁶ Bruun, Malte Konrad, *Aristokraternes katekismus* (Dansk folkebibliothek, no. 87); Rahbek, *Erindringer*, V, 409-13; Hansen, Ill. d. lit. hist., II, 366-389.

⁴⁷ Koch, *Oplysningstiden i den d. kirke*, 290-292.

- ⁴⁸ Söderhjelm, Altna, *Sverige och den franska revolutionen* (Stockholm, 1920), I, 157.
- ⁴⁹ Cf. ante, I, 189.
- ⁵⁰ Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, X, 203-206.
- ⁵¹ Benson, Adolph B., *Sweden and the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1926).
- ⁵² Söderhjelm, *op. cit.*, I, 139.
- ⁵³ Cf. especially, *ibid.*, I, 152-184, the definitive study of this subject.
- ⁵⁴ Söderhjelm, *ibid.*, I, 137-8.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 169-177.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 268. Cf., also, Schück och Warburg, *Huvuddragen*, II, 216, and *Ill. sv. lit. hist.*, II, part 1, 418.
- ⁵⁷ Even small girls in the cultivated homes of Sweden, like Malla Silfverstolpe, dreamed rapturously of such heroes of liberty as Washington, Kosciusko, and Napoleon. Silfverstolpe, Malla Montgomery, *Memoarer* (Stockholm, 2nd ed., 1914-1920), I, 49-50, 79, and 96.
- ⁵⁸ Silfverstolpe, *op. cit.*, I, 258; Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr. betänkande*, 93. On *enskifte*, cf. post, I, 280.
- ⁵⁹ Adlersparre, C. A., 1809 års revolution, I, 17-34 (Stockholm, 1849).
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 35-42.
- ⁶¹ For text of General Silversparre's account of the king's arrest, cf., Aall, Jacob, *Erindringer*, 655-660; Adlersparre, 1809 års revolution, I, 45-82; Anekarsvard, Karl Henrik, *Politisk trosbekännelse* (Stockholm, 1833), 5-56; Clason, Sam, "Vårt hundreårsminne: krisen 1808-1809," in *Hist. tidskr.* (S.), XXIX (1909), 1-49; Clason, Sam och Petersens, Carl af, *För hundra år sen; skildringar och bref från revolutions-åren, 1809-1810* (Stockholm, 1909-1910, 2 vols.), documents and personal letters; Sandegren, Sven Axel Magnus, *Till historien om statshvälfningen i Sverige 1809* (Gothenburg, 1890), 1-2, and *passim*; Silfverstolpe, *op. cit.*, II, 150-158.
- ⁶² Adlersparre, *op. cit.*, I, 120-132, gives a good account of Georg Adlersparre's earlier liberalism; Anekarsvard, *op. cit.*, 12-13, where Adlersparre is charged with desertion of his ideals; Höjer, N., "Hans Järta och Sveriges grundlagar" in *Hist. tidskr.* (S.), XXX (1910), 107; Kjellén, Rudolf, *Om den svenska grundlagens anda* (Gothenburg), 1897, 9-19.
- ⁶³ Adlersparre, *op. cit.*, I, 5.
- ⁶⁴ Sandegren, *op. cit.*, 56-63.
- ⁶⁵ Fahlbeck, *op. cit.*, 203-204.
- ⁶⁶ Quotation from Järta by Höjer, "Hans Järta," *loc. cit.*, 107.
- ⁶⁷ Andersson, Ivar, "Oppositionen" och ministeransvarigheten (Upsala, 1917), 1-8 and 24-57; Fahlbeck, *op. cit.*, 80-88; For a thorough study of methods by which the ministers were held to account by the riksdag, cf. Tynell, Knut, *Studier angående det svenska statsrådets politiska ansvarighet* (Lund, 1918), *passim*.
- ⁶⁸ Hofsten, Bengt von, *Brev från 1809 års riksdag*. Lydia Wahlstrom, ed. (Stockholm, [1913]). 102.
- ⁶⁹ Fahlbeck, *op. cit.*, 58-69 and 70-80; Hildebrand, *Svenska statsförf.*, 596-613.
- ⁷⁰ Brusewitz, Axel, *Repräsentationsfrågan vid 1809-1810 års riksdag* (Upsala, 1913), 30-191, and *passim*; Rexius, Gunnar, *Det svenska tvåkammarssystemets tillkomst och karaktär* (Upsala, 1915), 39-48; Svedelius, V. E., *Repräsentationsreformens historia* (Stockholm, 1889), 201, and 214-234.
- ⁷¹ Franzén, Hjalmar, *Repräsentationsfrågan, 1810-1830* (Upsala, 1914), 104-105.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, 41-50.
- ⁷³ "Hans Järta's tankar om föreningen mellan Sverige och Norge år 1814," in *Hist. tidskr.* (S.), XIV (1894), 179-180.
- ⁷⁴ Johnsen, in *N. H.*, V, part 2, 174-176.
- ⁷⁵ Daac, *Det gamle Christiania*, 221-228.
- ⁷⁶ *Norske intelligens-sedler* (Oslo), no. 3, Feb. 20, 1793.
- ⁷⁷ Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 186-188.
- ⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, 79.
- ⁷⁹ Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 320-321 and 254; Worm-Müller, *Norge gjennem nødsårene, 146-187*, and *passim*.
- ⁸⁰ Cf. post, I, 226-228.
- ⁸¹ Aall, Niels, . . . *Erindringer* (Oslo, 1911), 8.

⁸² Koht, Halldan, 1814 (Oslo, 1914), 3-4, and *passim*.

⁸³ Aall, Niels, *op. cit.*, 14-17; Johnsen, *Norges bonder*, 341-2; Sars, in *N. H.*, VI, part 1, 30 and 34; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 364 and 373-4.

⁸⁴ Aall, Jacob, *Erindringer*, 387-388.

⁸⁵ Koht, 1814, 347-348; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 377.

⁸⁶ Jacob Aall declared later that it was well "that the ability to speak in public had not as yet been developed to any high degree in the Eidsvold representatives . . . At Eidsvold, only a few men were able to conduct the parliamentary struggle with any skill or success, and these few belonged to the assembly's talented members, who were equal to their tasks . . ." Aall, Jacob, *op. cit.*, 430. This was written with plain reference to the kind of politics conducted by the representatives of the peasants in the *storting* sessions of the 1830's.

⁸⁷ For the text of the constitution, as amended at the special session of the *storting* and adopted November 14, 1814—amendments necessitated by the union with Sweden—*cf.*, *Stortings-forh.*, 1814, 665-702.

⁸⁸ Beigsgaard, Arne, "Spørsmålet om folkesuveræniteten i 1814," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 5R., VII (1927-1929), 225ff; Koht, Halvdan, "Grunnspørsmålet i 1814," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 5R., III (1916), 1-16.

⁸⁹ Nielsen, Yngvar, *Bidrag til Norges historie i 1814. Afhandlinger og aktytykker* (Oslo, 1882-1886), I, 243, and *passim*. Överland, *N. H.*, V, part 3, 2689-2693; Sars, in *N. H.*, VI, part 1, 25-74; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 385-391.

⁹⁰ Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 427.

⁹¹ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 250.

⁹² "Hans Järta's tankar," *etc.*, *loc. cit.*, 180.

⁹³ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 125-130, 155-165, and *passim*; Elviken, Andreas, *Die entwicklung des norwegischen nationalismus (Historische studien, heft 198, herausgegeben von Dr. E. Ebering.)* (Berlin, 1930), *passim*; "The genesis of Norwegian nationalism," in *Journal of modern history*, III, (September, 1931), 376-378; Worm-Müller, *Norge gjennom nordsarene*, 271-328.

⁹⁴ Barton, Sir D. Plunket, *Bernadotte, prince and king*, 1810-1844 (London, 1925), 1-154; *Correspondence inédite de l'empereur Alexander et de Bernadotte pendant l'année 1812, publiée par X* (Paris, 1909), *passim*; Forsberg, Einar, *Sverige och Preussen*, 1810-1815 (Upsala, 1922), *passim*; Klæber, Hans, *Marschall Bernadotte, kronprinz von Schweden* (Gotha, 1910), *passim*; Kuylenstierna, Oswald, *Karl Johan och Napoleon*, 1797-1814 (Stockholm, 1914), 272-274; Nielsen, Yngvar, *Kielerfreden* (Oslo, 1886); Pignaud, Leonce, *Bernadotte, Napoleon et les Bourbons (1797-1844)* (Paris, 1901), 121-125, and 146-147; Sörenson, Carl Th., *Bernadotte i Norden, eller Norges adskillelse fra Danmark, og forening med Sverige* (Copenhagen, 1902), 3 vols.

⁹⁵ For the text of Frederick VI's farewell message to the Norwegian people, *cf.*, *Collegialtidende* (February 12, 1814), 97-106; for evidence of the spirit in which news of the session was received in Norway, *cf.*, "Platous optegnelser fra aaret 1814," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 1 R., II (1872), 6-7. *Cf.*, also, Koht, "Grunnspørsmålet i 1814," *loc. cit.*, 3-7.

⁹⁶ Alin, Oscar, "Strodda bidrag till svenska statsskickets historia. IV. Sättet för riksaktens antagande 1815," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (S.), VII (1887), 297-324; Björlin, Gustaf, *Kriget i Norge 1814, efter samtidas vittnesbörd framställt* (Stockholm, 1893); Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 253-261; Gjerset, *op. cit.*, II, 420-446; Hansard, *Parliamentary debates*, April 21, and 29, and May 2, 10, and 12, 1814; Klæber, *op. cit.*, 434-454; Motzfeldt, Peter, *Statsraad Peter Motzfeldts dagbog fra det overordentlige storting 1814*. L. M. B. Aubert, ed. (Oslo, 1882), *passim*; Sars, in *N. H.*, VI, part 1, 74-144; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 395-408.

CHAPTER VII

¹ *Moral for unge kjøbmænd* (Tr. fr. Ger.), (Oslo, 1834), 27-28.

² *Cf. ante*, I, 21.

³ Brisman, Sven, *Sveriges affarsbanker. Grundläggningstiden* (Stockholm, 1924),

73.

⁴ Forsell, Carl af, *Resa till England* (Stockholm, 1833), 108-109.

⁵ Schweigaard, Anton Martin, *Ungdomsarbeider, forelæsnunger over den politiske økonomi*, Oscar Jaeger and Fr. Stang, editors (Oslo, 1904), 75, and 108-9.

⁶ For these articles cf. *ibid.*, "Inførselstolden og dens historie," 203-236; cf., also, Hertzberg, Ebbe, *Professor Schweigaard i hans offentlige virksomhed 1832-1870*, (Oslo, 1883), 77-78.

⁷ Gripenstedt, J. A., *Tal och anforanden* (Stockholm, 1866-1872), I, 297.

⁸ Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 14-15; though Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 405-411, holds that Danish economic liberalism was motivated far more by intellectual and political dogma than by economic factors, it is certain that this is more true of Denmark than of Sweden and Norway.

⁹ Brace, *op. cit.*, 213. Brace inquired of one of them if they expected any evil consequences. "He thinks not; says the English cannot make coarse goods cheaper than the Swedes, and that they never will have goods of enough different colors to suit the people here; 'They cannot except by hand-work. In fine muslins,' he says, 'they are far ahead of us and will be.'" Cf., von Hartmansdorff's somewhat facetious resolution to promote emigration on account of the ruin that would be brought on Borås by tariff reductions, *Ridderskapets och adelns protokoll*, 1853-54, XIII, 352.

¹⁰ Mügge, Theodor, *Nordisches bilderbuch; reisebilder* (Breslau, 3d ed., 1862), 185; "... Nur die Tragheit bestarken und den alten gewerblichen Schlandrian fördern."

¹¹ Agardh, C. A., *Tal om svenska naringarnes rigtning, hållet vid Vermlandske Hushållnings-Sällskapets stiftelsefest den 19 febr. 1853* (Stockholm, 1854), 22-24, and 32-34, quotation on page 34.

¹² Nyrop, Camillus, *Industriforeningen i Kobenhavn* (1838-1888) (Copenhagen, 1888), 124-5.

¹³ For a discussion of the part played by the Copenhagen *Grosserer Societet* (Association of Wholesale Merchants) in the downward revision of Danish tariffs, cf., Schovelin, Julius Vilhelm, *Fra den danske handels renaissance* (Copenhagen, 1924, 2 vols.), I, 101-134.

¹⁴ Bergsgård, Arne, *Ole Gabriel Ueland og bondepolitikken* (Oslo, 1932), II, 167-172; Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 388-9; Drachman, *op. cit.*, 38 and 44-45; Montgomery, Arthur, *Svensk traktatpolitik 1816-1914. En översikt av huvudmomenten i utvecklingen av Sveriges handels och sjöfartstraktater under det gångna århundradet, utarb. på uppdrag av Tuill- och traktat-kommittén* (Stockholm, 1921), 21 and *passim*.

Text of proposed Union Trade Law, *Bihang till riksståndens protokoll*, 1856-58, V, part I, no. 6.

Text of the *riksdag's* address to the king, where it is urged (p. 461) that the Swedish tariff as closely as possible approximate the Norwegian, *ibid.*, X, part I, no. 164, 461-528.

¹⁵ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 326-8, and *passim*.

¹⁶ The texts of these decrees appear in *Collegialtidende*, XLI (September 22, 1838), 733ff., and *Ny collegialtidende*, IV (March 30, 1844), 264ff., and May 4, 1844), 401-405.

For documents presented to the Estates, cf., *Roskilde stændertidende*, 1842, *betænkninger XXII og XXIII*, pp. XXXVI-XLIII; for the debates, *ibid.*, 2031-2151, and 3337-3346.

¹⁷ Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 461-464; Schovelin, Julius Vilhelm, *Fra kongegunst til selvstyre. Grosserersocietetet og dets komité*. (Copenhagen, 1917), 558-9.

¹⁸ *Departementstidenden*, XVI, no. 46-48 (Aug. 29, 1863), 629 ff., text of tariff law of July 4, 1863. Engeltøft, in *D. F. H.*, VII, 145-6; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 477-478; Scharling, in *Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, op. cit.*, II, 454.

¹⁹ Cf. *post*, I, 273-5.

²⁰ Fogdall, Sören, J. M. P., *Danish-American diplomacy, 1776-1920* (Univ. of Iowa studies; studies in social sciences, VIII, no. 2) (Iowa City, 1922), 166-85; Hill, Charles Edward, *The Danish sound dues and the command of the Baltic* (Durham, N. C., 1926), 214-286; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 451-461; Rubin, Marcus, *Sundtoldens aflösning*, in *Hist. tidskr.* (D) 7 R., VI (1905-06), 172-311, quotation on p. 172; Schovelin, *Fra kongegunst til selvstyre*, I, 101-134, and 288-318. For an interesting illustration of how contemporaries viewed the problem, cf. Mügge, *op. cit.*, 347-350.

²¹ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 82-96. For the Hauge movement *cf. post*, I, 315-20. For the debates on the tariff question in 1833, *cf.*, *Stortings-efterr.*, 1814-33, III, 489-500.

²² *Ibid.*, I, 186-94, 328-340, and *passim*; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 712-718; Drachman, *op. cit.*, 85-6, 89-91; For debates of the tariff of 1842, *cf. Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-54, II, 391-403.

²³ The best authority on Swedish tariff history is Montgomery, Arthur, *Svensk traktatpolitik* 1816-1914; *cf.* also his *Industrialismens genombrutt i Sverige*, 138-145; Drachman, *op. cit.*, 38; Heckscher, Eli F., "Lärdomar av 1800-talets svenska handelspolitik," in *Ekonomi och historia*, 256-261; Tull-och traktatkommitteens utredningar och betänkanden, XXXVI (*Statens offentliga utredningar*, 1924: 37 *Finans departementet*) (Stockholm, 1924), part I, 1-2.

For expressions by the peasants' chamber on tariff reduction, *cf. Bonde-ståndets protokoll*, 1856-58, VII, 33-91.

²⁴ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, II, 328-332; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 720-723; Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 47; Montgomery, *Svensk traktatpolitik*, 36-7, and *passim*; *Industrialismens genombrutt*, 145.

²⁵ Hovde, Brynjolf J., *Diplomatic relations of the United States with Sweden and Norway* (Univ. of Iowa studies in the social sciences, VII, No. 4.) (Iowa City, 1921), 18-33; Montgomery, *Svensk traktatpolitik*, 6-8.

²⁶ Heckscher, "Lärdomar," *etc.*, in *Ekonomi och historia*, 245-248; Montgomery, *Svensk traktatpolitik*, 16-31.

²⁷ *Cf.* the article on "Class" by Paul Mombert, in *Encyclopaedia of the social sciences*, III, 534.

²⁸ *Cf. ante*, I, 22.

²⁹ Pio, Frantz, *Den fri konkurrences gennembrud i England* (Copenhagen, 1902), 318; Thornberg, E. H., *Samfundsklasser och politiska partier i Sverige* (Stockholm, 1917), 17-18.

³⁰ Nyrop, in Carlsen *et al.*, *Danmarks kultur*, 694-7.

³¹ Berg, R., *Haandværkerliv i hellig og søgn* (Copenhagen, 1926), *passim*; Christensen, (*København*, 1840-1857, 265-282; Næringsfrihedens udveckling i Sverige 1809-36, *passim*; Scharling, in Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 447-448.

³² Renholm records in his memoirs how the Swedish journeymen were disliked, Renholm, G., *Sedt och hört. Ur gamla minnen* (Stockholm, 1901), 175; and the governor of Östergötland province, Count C. O. Palmstjärna, records in his quinquennial report: "The wanderings of the journeymen have continued to be a plague to the provinces, and of this there will be no end so long as the wanderings may continue throughout life for such as neither will nor can assist the established masters in the crafts," *K. b.'s femårsberättelser*, 1837-42, Östergötlands län, 29. There were many complaints against wandering journeymen in Denmark, too; and in 1828 they were required to present pass-books, without which they were subject to arrest as vagrants. *Collegialtidende*, December 27, 1828, 969-983.

³³ Munch, *Købstadstyrelsen i Danmark*, II, 105.

³⁴ Mackeprang, Edv. Ph., "Danske haandværkerlaug i nutiden," in *Tidsskrift for industri*, XI (1910), 85.

³⁵ Tvethe, M. Braun, *Norges statistikk* (Oslo, 1848), 100-101.

³⁶ Lindström, *op. cit.*, 116, 275, and 278.

³⁷ Bauer, Adolf, *Haandværkerforeningen i København*, 1840-90 (Copenhagen, 1890), 91-127; Christensen, *op. cit.*, 602-609; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 292-4.

³⁸ Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 608; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrutt*, 133-134.

³⁹ Bauer, *op. cit.*, 91-127.

⁴⁰ On the Swedish pauper problem, *cf. post*, II, 621-5.

The attitude of the rural population was generally the same as that of the Swedish chamber of peasants in the *riksdag* of 1828-30, where there was practical unanimity in favor of occupational freedom. *Bondeståndets protokoller*, 1828-1830, IX, 689-691.

⁴¹ Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr. betänkande*, 128-9.

⁴² Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 319-325; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII; Montgomery, *In-*

industriismens genombrott, 132-3; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 251-252, and 257-258.

⁴⁸ Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 285-288; Lindström, *op. cit.*, 275-309; Montgomery, *Industriismens genombrott*, 132-133;

As an example of the kind of restrictions placed upon the occupations, the following notes taken at random from the Danish *Ny collegialtudente*, I (1841), may prove interesting:

1. A dyer must not maintain an establishment in another city for the purpose of receiving orders or delivering what may have been ordered, p. 508.

2. Rural residents are permitted to sell in the cities wooden shoes which are joined with wire and nails, p. 66.

3. It may not be forbidden residents of cities to have smithy products made by people in their permanent employ, p. 679.

4. Village smithies are permitted to repair agricultural implements for anyone, p. 957.

5. It may not be forbidden women in the cities to take in yarn to be woven for others, so long as the weaving falls within the category of domestic craftsmanship, p. 960.

⁴⁴ Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 611-614.

⁴⁵ Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 312-313.

⁴⁶ Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 467-475, and 608; Lehmann, Orla, *Efterladte skifter* (Copenhagen, 1872-1874), I, 216-217; Nyrop, *Industriforeningen, etc.*, 124-5.

⁴⁷ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 322-325; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VIII, 293. The Norwegian bill for freedom of occupation (1827) may be found in *Stortings-efterr.*, 1814-1833, II, 809-811. The Norwegian law of 1839 on freedom of occupation and the debates pertaining thereto are in *Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-54, I, 701-709.

⁴⁸ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 218-9; Clason, in *S. H. V. D.*, XI, 312-313, 326-328; Hallendorff, in *S. H. V. D.*, XII, 297; Lindström, *op. cit.*, 64 ff.; Montgomery, *Industriismens genombrott*, 135.

⁴⁹ *Beretning om forhandlingerne paa rigsdagen* (Copenhagen, 1848-1849), II, 2597-2606, and 3202-3208; Bruun, Henry, *Den sociale udvikling i byerne 1857-1871* (*Sociale studier i dansk historie efter 1857*, Povl Engelstoft og Hans Jensen, eds.) (Copenhagen, 1930), 1-3; Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 602-617; *Departementstidenden*, XI (1858), 81-107, 117-122 (Text of the Danish law of December 29, 1857, establishing freedom of occupation and of internal trade); Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 428-447; Nyrop, in Carlsen, et al., *Danmarks kultur*, 697.

⁵⁰ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 325-328, shows conclusively how the special interests of the Norwegian rural and urban communities determined their position on freedom of internal trade. Whatever their indoctrinated representatives in the *storting* might say, the townsmen were generally reluctant to give up the special favors with which the old legislation had endowed them. The contest for freedom of occupation and internal trade was therefore an important phase of that struggle between the rural proletariat and the bourgeois-bureaucratic upper class, which Professor Halvdan Koht has demonstrated to be the central theme in modern Norwegian history. The evidence is strong that this struggle was a determining factor also in Swedish and Danish history, although no special studies in this point of view have there been made.

For other references on the movement for freedom of internal trade, cf., Montgomery, *Industriismens genombrott*, 141-142, and 146-147, and footnotes 29-49 above.

On the Norwegian trade law of 1842, cf., *Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-1854, II, 293-315; texts of the Danish laws may be found in *Departementstidenden*, IX (1856), 258-259, and X (1857), 262-263. The report of the *riksdag* committee which led to the adoption of the Swedish law of 1864 is in *Bihang till riksständens protokoll*, 1862-1863, VII, part 2, no. 17; and the text of the Underdånig skrifvelse adopted by all the Estates, *ibid.*, X, part 1, no. 132.

⁵¹ Renholm, *op. cit.*, 166 and 176, states that abuse of credit and excessive competition resulted from the freeing of domestic trade, and that workmanship at first deteriorated as a result of the removal of the gild standards. To the charge that freedom was producing disorder, Geijer replied in 1847, in *Dagligt allehanda*, that

this was but a passing phase and that freedom would create its own genuine order, "This is the whole faith of *liberalism*, and it leads to salvation *Samlade skrifter*, VII, 483 The Norwegian special committee on the labor question, however, directed labor's attention to the numerous bankruptcies resulting from the law of 1842 as proof of the sacrifice brought by the bourgeoisie to the altar of the general welfare *Støttings forh*, 1851, VII, part 2, 11

⁵² Agardh och Ljungberg, *op cit*, IV, 219-224 Statistics on this point are not very accurate

⁵³ Bruun, *op cit*, 39, Nielsen, *op cit*, 447, Scharling, in Falbe Hansen og Scharling, *op cit*, II, 473

⁵⁴ Bauer, *op cit*, *passim* Eliason, Åke, *Stockholms stads handverkareforening*, 1865-1915 *Historik* (Stockholm, 1915), 1-16, and *passim*, Nyrop, Camillus, *Meddelelse fra industriens omraade* (Copenhagen, 1876), 61-122

⁵⁵ *Cf post*, I, 301

⁵⁶ The average annual gold output of the world, 1851-1885, was 121.21%, as compared with 15.74% for the world during the period 1815-1850 *Encycl Soc Sci*, VI, 689

⁵⁷ Brisman, *op cit* 160 The last one *Gota Kanals Diskont*, closed in 1817, Wessling, *op cit*, 41-42

⁵⁸ Davidson, *Tiden 1834-1860* (*Sveriges riksbank*, IV), 11-40, Flux, *op cit*, 42-49, states that *Sveriges riksbank* between 1852 and 1862 established 22 branches in as many provincial towns, thereafter branches were liquidated Keilhau, in *N F L H*, VIII, 321-322, and 329-330, and IX, 138-9, Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott* 199-202, Nielsen, *op cit*, 507-510

⁵⁹ The Danish National Bank had the authority to establish branches, a feature that was copied from Napoleon's charter for the Bank of France, but in spite of considerable public demand, it was not until 1847 that the first branch was opened in Odense *Cf*, Rubow, *op cit*, 242-252

⁶⁰ It was not until 1864 that the *Goteborgs Sparbank*, founded in 1820 as the first one in Sweden, began to keep open to the public every day, *Cf*, Nielsen, *op cit*, 506-507; Weibull, C G, *Goteborgs sparbank 1820-1920* (Gothenburg, 1920), 60ff

⁶¹ Sometimes the conversion of a district to the idea of depositing in a savings bank was sudden, as in the case of the village of Stoby on the island of Lolland Here a robbery attended by a murder caused a rush to the bank, which received a collection of coins and bills fit for a museum Many of the bills were badly damaged by mice or moisture. *Cf*, Bisgaard, H L, *Danmarks Sparekasser* (Vejle, 1910), 61

⁶² The following table is interesting evidence, both of the rapid development of Norwegian savings banks in the early 'forties, and of the tardiness of the rural districts *Cf*, Tvethe, *op cit*, 201

	Number		Capital (Spd)		Deposits (Spd)		Total (Spd)	
	1840	1845	1840	1845	1840	1845	1840	1845
Urban	20	30	140,000	363,000	1,659,000	3,214,000	1,799,000	3,577,000
Rural	4	29	5,000	14,000	13,000	170,000	18,000	184,000
Totals	24	59	145,000	377,000	1,672,000	3,384,000	1,817,000	3,761,000

In 1834, Sweden had 31 savings banks, with 22,964 depositors, and with capital resources to the value of 2,333,536 *rd rmt*, in 1860 there were 146 banks, 200,932 depositors, and capital resources to the value of 29,093,260 *rd rmt Cf*, [*Finanskommittén*], *Underdåmgt betänkande angående Sveriges ekonomiska och finansiella utveckling under åren 1834-1860* (Stockholm, 1863), 71-72 Denmark, in 1847, had 34 savings banks, with capital resources of 8,700,000 *rd d*, in 1856, 47 savings banks, with capital resources of 23,645,000 *ld*, *cf* Bisgaard, *op cit*, 57-70, *cf*, also, Bosse, *op cit*, II, 78-84

⁶³ For details, *cf*, [*Finanskommittén*], *Underdåmgt betänkande*, 96-8 *Cf*, also, Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 38-9.

⁶⁴ [*Finanskommittén*], *Underdåmgt betänkande*, 72-73

⁶⁵ Larsen, C G, *Det danske landbrugs historie* (Copenhagen, 1895), 141-143

Sveiges allmänna hypoteksbank 1861-1911 (Stockholm, 1911), 18, and 25-35. The Swedish central mortgage bank antedated the better known Prussian institution by twelve years. Cf. also Bergsgård, *op cit* I, 587-591, Bosse, *op cit*, II, 69-75, Nielsen, *op cit* 510-511.

⁶⁶ The Swedish economists Agardh and Ljungberg in 1852 complained bitterly that whereas in other countries the state was a borrower of capital, and private capitalists were lenders, in Sweden the reverse was true. In other countries there are thousands of persons who live by the interest they receive, but in Sweden such a class does not exist. Sweden has no other capitalists than the public funds. Sweden has only debtors.

They pointed with envy at the many private banks being established in Great Britain and the United States, urging that Sweden imitate the example of these countries. *Op cit* I 210-214. They felt it would be impossible for private enterprise to undertake the supply of large funds, e.g. for railway building. The state ought to do that but was pursuing a narrow minded no debt policy. A domestic public debt system would therefore help to mobilize capital. *Ibid* 42, and II, 182-214. Sweden was not appreciably worse off in this respect than Norway.

⁶⁷ 'This picture of general decentralization but provincial centralization corresponds very well on the whole with the economic situation within Sweden when the capital did not as yet play any more extensive role in the national economy than it could by virtue of being the largest among the more considerable cities of the period. Cf. Hallendorff, C., *Svenska handelsbanken* 1871-1921 (Stockholm 1921), 10, Montgomery, *Industrialisomens genombrott* 197-8. Wessling, *op cit*, 43-47.

⁶⁸ Brisman, Sven, *Aktiebolaget Göteborgs bank*, 1848-1923, manuskript (Gothenburg, 1923), 5-64, Flux, *op cit* 30-64, Hallendorff, *op cit*, 10-11, Sundbarg, *Emigrationsstat, betänkande* 147, Thalbitzer, Carl, *De skandinaviske banker under krigen* (Copenhagen, 1918), 9, Wessling, *op cit*, 45-47.

⁶⁹ Ueland's interesting struggle against Schweigaard in this matter is well related by Bergsgård, *op cit* I, 587-591. Cf. also, *Storings-efter*, 1836-54, III, 323-328, yet Ueland had nothing against the proposal in 1851, to authorize private banks to issue bank notes. He believed very much both in 1848 and 1851, that a large part of Norway's trouble was due to scarcity of paper money, *Storings-efter*, 1836-1854, III, 897-899. Here we find the same currency heresy as flourished in agrarian America.

⁷⁰ Bosse, *op cit*, II, 90, Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 139-40.

⁷¹ Bosse, *op cit*, II, 90-93, Christensen, *København* 1840-1857, 597-599, Nielsen, *op cit*, 510, Schovelin, Julius Vilhelm, *Privatbanken*, 1857-1907 (Copenhagen, 1907), 1-27.

⁷² Brisman, *Göteborgs bank*, 69-70, 84, and 109-110, Brisman, *Den stora reformperioden*, 1860-1904 (*Sveiges riksbank* IV), 2-7.

⁷³ Christensen, *op cit*, 599-602, Engelstoft, in *D F H*, VII, 142-144, Hallendorff, in *S H V D*, XII, 175-6, Hoffstad, *op cit*, 56, Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 404-409, Nielsen, *op cit*, 512-514, Kiaer, A. N., et al., eds, *Norges land og folk* (Oslo, 1884-1921), III (Kristiania), part 3, 220-223, Schovelin, *Privatbanken*, 39-52, and *Den danske handels renaissance*, II, 343-344, and 452-454.

⁷⁴ Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 345-351, Nielsen, *op cit*, 470-473, Nyrop, *Meddelelser fra industriens omkræde*, 201-222.

⁷⁵ Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 412-414, Montgomery, *Industrialisomens genombrott*, 196-7. Agardh and Ljungberg complained in 1852 that there was so little free capital in Sweden that shares had to be made so small as to cost "only a little more than a couple of theater tickets," *op cit*, I, 213; [*Finanskommittén*] *Underdanigt betänkande*, 4-5.

Between 1848 and 1867, new corporations were registered in Sweden, with a total minimum capital of about 164,000,000 *kr*. The largest was capitalized at 18,000,000 *kr*, the smallest issued only a few hundred shares at 10 *kr* each. The highest number registered in any one year was 52 (1867), in some years as few as ten. Forsell, Hans, "Ekonomiska data 1870-1873, Sveiges ekonomiska utveckling," in *Svensk tidsskrift för litteratur, politik, och ekonomi*, V (1874), 538.

⁷⁶ Almqvist, Joh., *Stockholms stads brandförsäkringskontor* 1746-1921 (Stockholm, 1921), 14-66, Hansson, Chr., in Hoffstad, *op cit*, 105-108, Odhner, *op cit*,

II, 50-51; Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr. betänkande*, 63; Vogt, Jorgen Herman, *op. cit.*, 358-359.

The Norwegian companies, *Storebrand* and *Lillebrand* were founded in Christiania in 1847; the Swedish company *Scandia* in 1855. In 1865 there were several fire insurance companies in Sweden, the total value of whose policies was officially estimated at 1,500,000,000 rdl., an increase of 300,000,000 rdl. since 1860; K. b.'s *femårsberättelser*, 1861-56, *sammandrag*, 143.

⁷⁷ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, II, 253; Burrau, C., in Carlsen, et. al., *op. cit.*, 629-636; Hansson, in Hoffstad, *op. cit.*, 105-114.

⁷⁸ Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 467-472; in 1849, Agardh declared that the total industrial population of Sweden, owners and workers, only numbered 22,857 and the average output per person was only 1022 rdr. bco. (*Svenska näringsvarnas räkning* 22), but in 1856 the German student of Scandinavian affairs, Mügge, found that "the last years have in Sweden done wonders." (*op. cit.*, 186); Kiaer, ed., *Norges land og folk* (*Akershus amt*), 269-70.

⁷⁹ Laing, *A Tour in Sweden*, 299; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 464-469.

⁸⁰ Sée, Henri, *Modern capitalism* (New York, 1928), 116-117; Sombart, *op. cit.*, I, part I, 430-445, 687-714, and II, part I, 533-581.

⁸¹ Mügge compared the Norwegian and Swedish workmen with the German (1856), much to the advantage of the latter; and of the Swedish people in general he wrote that they inclined too much to the enjoyment of material things. "Mühsam Geld zu erwerben, industriell spekulativ zu sein ist ihre Sache nicht, darum machen so viele Fremde, namentlich Deutsche welche sich hier niederlassen, ihr Glück, weil sie einziger und fleissiger sich bestreben und sparsamer haus zu halten wissen . . ." He admitted, however, that in the 'fifties there had occurred a notable change for the better: *op. cit.*, 60-61 (quotation), 185, and 301.

Mügge's indictment of the Swedish workman is no more severe, however, than that of the Danish worker by Bergsøe, A. F., *Den danske stats statistik* (Copenhagen, 1844-53, 4 vols.), I, 515-6.

⁸² Brace questioned an Englishman, whom he found serving as foreman in a cotton mill in south-eastern Sweden (1856), on the capacity of the Swedes for machinery, and received an illuminating answer. "They have a great capability, sir, for the spindles; they are such a patient set you know. But the women [the mill employed mostly women], sir, there's the rub! They were never accustomed to close work. Always at 'ome, they've been in the habit of talkin' and chattin', you know, as they work, and I find it very 'ard to keep 'em hattentive and considerate-some. And they are so tricky. Why, two Swedish women can't possibly meet without a little dance, just together, which don't do you know here, sir. But they'll learn. It's a young nation, sir; very young . . . It will take time—time, sir, before they do as the English and Americans." *Op. cit.*, 218.

⁸³ Mackeprang, Edv., *Afsnit af den danske arbejderbevægelses historie* (Copenhagen, 1911), 74-5; Rawert, C. J., *Kongeriget Danmarks industrielle forhold fra de ældste tider indtil begyndelsen af 1848* (Copenhagen, 1850), 577.

⁸⁴ On these funds, cf., Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 276-8.

⁸⁵ Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 474; Mathieson, F., "Historisk oversigt over industriforeningens virksomhed fra dens stiftelse til vore dage," in *Maaanedsskr. udg. af industriforeningen*, II (1867), 129-145; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 470; Nyrop, in Carlsen et. al., *op. cit.*, 695-7; Rawert, *op. cit.*, 110-157.

⁸⁶ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 286-300; Nyrop, Camillus, *Bidrag til den danske industris historie* (Copenhagen, 1873), 127-189.

⁸⁷ Cf. *post*, II, 607-11.

⁸⁸ Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 470; Jacobsen, J. C., "Bryggeri-industriens fremskridt," in *Tekniske forenings tidsskr.*, VIII (1884), 139; Nyrop, *Industriforeningen i København*, 7-9.

⁸⁹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 280-286; Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 113-114.

⁹⁰ Tvethé, *op. cit.*, 91.

(Stockholm, 1916), 24-25. Cf. also *post*, I, 253.

⁹¹ Petander, Karl, *Arbetsintensiteten i Sveriges mekaniska verkstadsindustri*

⁹² Cf. *ante*, I, 26-8.

⁹³ Nyrop, *Meddelelser fra industriens omraade*, 175 ff.

⁹⁴ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 251; *Biographiskt lexicon öfver namnkunniga svenska män*, "Mårten Triewald"; Sir Robert Ker Porter, a very intelligent observer, was much impressed by the water-power machinery he saw at the silver mine at Sala, Sweden, in 1808, *Traveling sketches in Russia and Sweden. During the years, 1806-1807, 1808* (Philadelphia, 1809), 375-6. He also saw the new engine in operation at Dannemora, *ibid.*, 371-2.

⁹⁵ *Biographiskt lexicon, etc.*, "Samuel Owen"; Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 36.

⁹⁶ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 251-254; Geijer, Erik Gustaf, *Minnen. Utdrag ur bref och dagböcker . . .* Ed. by Fredrik Book (Stockholm, 1915), 228; *Motala verkstads minneskrift*, 35, and *passim*; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 130-131.

⁹⁷ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 248-250; Mügge was much impressed by the Motala works in 1856, *op. cit.*, 243-244.

⁹⁸ Nyrop, *Bidrag til den danske industris historie*, 7-11, and *Meddelelser fra industriens omraade*, 175-200; *Oversigt over de af amtmandene afgivne rapporter*, 1829 (Oslo), 19.

⁹⁹ Linné records (*Skånska resa*, 195), that Ernest and Niclas Suell (Sewell?) imported English coal for their lime kiln at Malmö as early as 1749.

¹⁰⁰ The Danish economist, Mendel Levin Nathanson, pointed out as early as 1832 that coal could be obtained cheaply and that the low wage rates in Denmark presented advantages to industry. *Danmarks handel, skibsfart, penge- og finansvæsen fra 1730 til 1830*, I, 386-389.

¹⁰¹ The sewing machine was an especially potent instrument for the conversion of the common people to machinery. It was small enough to go into any household and possessed obvious practical utility. Cf., Riis, Jacob, *The old town* (New York, 1909), 11-12.

¹⁰² Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, II, 144; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 280-306, contains statistical material on the Norwegian timber industry, but it has not always been critically used. Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 86-87; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 55-56, and 100; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 98-100; Norway, in this as in most other matters, gave legal expression to the new economic theory earlier than Sweden; the basic laws in the former were adopted in 1818, 1836, and 1854, in the latter in 1842 and 1863.

¹⁰³ Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 87; Hjelmérus, J., *Bidrag till svenska jordeganderättens historia* (Lunds universitets årsskrift, XX) (Lund, 1884), 81-94; Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, III.

Complaints of wasteful exploitation were no less frequent in this period than before; cf., e. g. that of F. Wedel-Jarlsberg, governor of Bratsberg Amt (Norway) in *Amtmændenes femårsberetninger*, 1830-35, 132, and the summary, *ibid.*, 1856-60, IX. As late as 1856, Crown Prince Charles (Charles XV), then viceroy in Norway, urged that, in order to conserve the Norwegian forest commons they be transferred entirely to private ownership. "Kronprins Carls rapport," in *Hist. tidsskr.* (N.), 4 R., IV (1907), 422-423.

¹⁰⁴ Swedish average annual lumber and timber exports mounted as follows (according to Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 98):

1832-35	190,000 cubic metres	1851-55	667,000 cubic metres
1836-40	258,000 " "	1856-60	800,000 " "
1841-45	331,000 " "	1861-65	1,125,000 " "
1846-50	393,000 " "	1866-70	1,782,000 " "

Schweigaard, *Norges statistik*, 94, estimates that in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, lumber and timber exports equalled the fish exports in annual value (about 3,000,000 *spälr.*), and that the value of the production was 36.3% of that of animal husbandry, and about 50% of that of agriculture. In 1865, Norway had 1501 sawmills, employing 6,997 men; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 590.

¹⁰⁵ Sombart, *op. cit.*, I, part 2, 883-895.

¹⁰⁶ Carlgren, *op. cit.*, 132-133; Mügge, *op. cit.*, 190. The artist Edward Price found three Scotchmen and a Swede who had lived in Scotland as superintendents of sawmills near Trollhättan in 1826, Forester, ed., *Norway and Its Scenery*, 136-7.

¹⁰⁷ Clapham, J. E., *Economic history of France and Germany 1815-1914* (Cam-

bridge, 3rd ed., 1928), 90 "The close regulation of the Swedish iron industry prior to the nineteenth century created within it a lofty technical tradition, with warm devotion to the profession and a sense of responsibility for the quality of the product, a tradition which down to the present day has carried the Swedish iron industry through the difficulties caused by foreign competition." Boethius, Bertil "Svensk brukshistoria några iandteckningar till den nyare litteraturen, in *Nordisk tidsskr* (Letterst), XXXVI (1923), 164

On such a neutral market as that of Hamburg, Swedish bar iron always, between 1847 and 1912, commanded a better price than English, Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutr betänkande*, 118, table

¹⁰⁸ Klinckowstrom, who travelled in the United States as a scout for the Swedish iron industry, was impressed with the possibilities of the market there. He visited Pennsylvania, and realized its resources in ore, forests and coal, but found production costs so high as to afford the Swedish iron trade the advantage. Since the "childlike Americans" seemed to prefer beauty to quality, he urged his countrymen to give their wares an attractive design after the manner of the shrewd Englishmen. Klinckowstrom, Axel Leonhard, friherre, *Brief om de Forenede Staternes forfattede under en resa till Amerika åren 1818, 1919, 1820* (Stockholm, 1824), 329-340

¹⁰⁹ Cf ante I, 253

¹¹⁰ Bosse, *op cit*, II, 470, [Finanskommitteén], *Underdånigt betänkande* 4 and 37, Heckscher, "Den gamle svenska brukslägsstiftningens betydelse," in *En bergsbok till Carl Sahlin* 185, Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott* 66-82

¹¹¹ *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1840-1845, summary, XIII-XIV, and 1846-50, summary, XX-XXI, Kraemer, R. von, *Upsala län i Temåshetattelser* 1851-1855, 20, Leffler, J. A., "Tancashiresmidets införande i Sverige" in *En bergsbok till Carl Sahlin* 113-124, and *passim*. The reports of the provincial governors of both Sweden and Norway contain valuable information on the progress being made, cf., e.g., Morner, Carl Stellan, *Kronobergs län, in Landshöfvinge-berättelser*, 1822, 9-10, Bosse, *op cit* II, 468-471

¹¹² Åkerman, Rich., "Om den svenska järnhandteringens utvecklings-studier," in *Nordisk tidsskr*, ny följd, IX (1896), 352-3 and *passim*

¹¹³ [Finanskommitteén], *Underdånigt betänkande* 35, Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutr betänkande*, *passim*

¹¹⁴ Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 73, 80-82, and 128-130, Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutr betänkande* 134. An American and a German traveller, both competent observers, found the Swedish iron industry rather crude and backward in 1856. Brace, *op cit*, 262, and Mugge, *op cit*, 185-186

¹¹⁵ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op cit*, IV, 240, *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1846-1850, summary, XXIV-XXXII, Nielsen, *op cit*, 370-371. One skålpund equals 937 pounds

¹¹⁶ Brace, *op cit*, 208-221, has an interesting description of the Borås industries as he saw them in 1856, Brismann, Sven, *Åkebolaget Göteborgs Bank* 1848-1923, 57, Linné, *Västgöta resa* 121-123; Mannerfelt, O. och Danielson, H. *Sven Eriksons och Rydholmsholms fabriks historia* 1834-1866 (Borås, 1924), *passim*; Montgomery *Industrialismens genombrott*, 125-6

¹¹⁷ In 1845 two young men from Christiania, Adam Severin Hiorth and Knud Graah, to the great surprise of each, met while inspecting a cotton machine in Manchester. Quite independently they had decided to begin cotton manufacture in the Norwegian capital. Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 133

¹¹⁸ Bosse, *op cit*, II, 573-578, Smith, S. B., in *Den norske sjofarts historie*, III, part 1, 137-152

¹¹⁹ Bergsøe, *op cit*, II, 609-610, Kiaer, A. N., "Det skandinaviske dampskib-rederis første begyndelser og senere fremvæxt," in *Nordisk tidsskr* (1888), 259-263; Nyrop, *Bidrag til den danske industris historie* 4-62

¹²⁰ Bosse, *op cit* II, 209-223, and 250-263; Law abolishing fish-tithe (to pistons and Crown), 1845, *Stortings-efterr*, 1836-54, II, 768-773, cf., also, Vogt, *op cit*, 334-337

¹²¹ *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1840-45, summary, VII-X, and 1846-50, summary XII-XVI; Iversen, Thor, in *Den norske sjofarts historie*, III, part 2, 401; Keilhau, in *N F L H*, IX, 382-389, Risting, Sigurd, in *Den norske sjofarts historie*,

III, part 2, 328-332, Schweggaard, *op cit*, 100-101, Wiuming, Jens, *Danmarks statistik* (Copenhagen, 1924), 240

¹²² *Op cit*, IV, 231

¹²³ *Ibid*, 239

¹²⁴ Professor Yngvar Nielsen, upon whom most of the writers have relied, was clearly wrong, Oskai Kristiansen has shown, when he maintained that by 1814 Norway had gotten the most important part of the present network of roads. Cf Nielsen, 'Det norske vejvæsens udvikling for 1814, in *Hist tidsskr* (N), 1 R, IV (1887), 218-266, and Kristiansen, *Samferdsel i Norge 1814-1830* (Oslo, 1926), 123

¹²⁵ Sweden has "die schonsten Wege, die ein Land haben kann," wrote the German professor, Johan Georg Busch in 1780, *op cit*, 38-39, Horace Mariyat contends that Macadam conceived his new ideas of road making, on a journey through Scania, publishing a pamphlet on the subject when he returned to England, cf, *One year in Sweden* (London, 1862, 2 vols.), 65-66

¹²⁶ Carlsund, A. G., *Anteckningar under resor i England, Frankrike och Nederländerna, åren 1825 till 1828* (Stockholm, 1834), 160-162, Forsell, *Resa till England*, 9-15

¹²⁷ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op cit*, IV, 348, Bergsoe, *op cit* II, 621-631, Keilhau, in N F L H, IX, 89-103, Kristiansen, *Samferdsel i Norge*, 1-126

'We have no roads in America equal to the Norwegian,' wrote Brace (1856), *op cit*, 150, and Bayard Taylor corroborated him the next year, *Nordische reise* (Leipzig, 1858), 223

¹²⁸ Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 180, cf also Heckscher, Eli F., *Till belysning af jarnvägarnas betydelse for Sveriges ekonomiska utveckling* (Stockholm, 1907), 88

¹²⁹ Travellers were always impressed by this canal, with its nine locks, cut through solid rock "As a work of art," wrote the widely travelled Italian, Giuseppe Acerbi, "and of bold, persevering design, it is not too much to say, that it is the first in the world, even the Duke of Bridgewater's canal in England, and that of Languedoc in France, not excepted" *Travels through Sweden, Finland, and Lapland, to the North Cape, in the years 1798 and 1799* (London, 1802, 2 vols.), I, 18-26, cf also Inglis, *op cit*, 296-301

¹³⁰ Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 121-122

¹³¹ Owen built *The Witch* in 1816, equipped with screw propellers and movable cylinder, but it was a failure, and both principles were abandoned in the next two vessels, built in 1816 and 1817, one of which, the *Amphitrite*, was successful. Klier, 'Skandinaviske dampskibsfærdens begyndelse,' *loc cit*, 259-263

The Motala shops, between 1822 and 1844, built marine engines to the value of 1,002,680 *rids beo*, and during the next ten years delivered 38 complete steamships and 25 marine engines. Both Motala and Keilers & Co in Gothenburg constructed their steamships of iron in the late 'forties and fifties. Agardh och Ljungberg, *op cit*, 248-250

¹³² [Finanskommittén], *Underdåigt betänkande*, 47

¹³³ Bergsoe, *op cit*, II, 594, Keilhau, in N F L H, VIII, 336-7 Nyrop, *Bidrag til den danske industris historie*, 11-18. For his extravagance, the Norwegian minister who purchased the steamers was impeached, but acquitted

¹³⁴ Forester, *op cit*, 59-60, Pottinger, Sir Henry, *Flood, fell and forest* (London, 1905, 2 vols.), I, 74

¹³⁵ Kristiansen, 'Norges skibsfart,' *loc cit*, 427, Penge, *kapital og arbeid*, 258-321

¹³⁶ Kristiansen, "Norges skibsfart," *loc cit*, 408-411, Montgomery, *Svensk trafikpolitik*, 21, Schweggaard, *Norges statistik*, 150-155, Schweggaard shows how Norway's trade with Sweden increased after 1827, and how very successfully Norway became a carrier of Swedish exports to foreign countries, *ibid*, 155 and 177

¹³⁷ Cf, e.g., Sundbarg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 133. They angrily repudiated the charge that Norway had derived no benefits from the union

¹³⁸ Christensen, *København, 1840-1857*, 371-2, Keilhau, in N F L H, IX, 366-381, Worm-Müller, ed., *Den norske sjofarts historie*, III, *passim*

¹³⁹ *Stortingsforh.*, 1845, *propositioner*, No 6, 26-27

¹⁴⁰ Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 376-380.

¹⁴¹ *Cf. post*, I, 273-5.

¹⁴² In 1845 the shipping of that city reached the low point of 251 ships with a total tonnage of 29,000; in 1857, there were 312 ships with a tonnage of 43,360. Christensen, *København*, 1840-1857, 367 and 371.

¹⁴³ [Finanskomiteen], *Underdåmt betänkanke*, 47.

¹⁴⁴ *Cf., e. g.*, Forsell, *Resa till England*, 170-180. Forsell rode the Liverpool-Manchester railway in 1832.

¹⁴⁵ Hahn-Hahn, *op. cit.*, 53.

¹⁴⁶ Writing in 1852, Agardh and Ljungberg chided the Swedish *riksdag* for its caution. With no national debt whatever, that body was being so niggardly in its use of the public credit, that "it is as if judgment day was expected before the next *riksdag*." *Op. cit.*, I, 212.

¹⁴⁷ In 1840 the Roskilde Estates gave vigorous expression to the desirability of the Husum-Tønning railway as a means of drawing the North Sea-Baltic trade away from Hamburg and Lübeck; they resolved by a vote of 50-4 that before any concession should be granted for a railway across the peninsula all the Estates ought to be consulted. *Ny collegaltidende*, I (1841), 198-202; *Roskilde stænder-tidende*, 1840, *betänkning* XXXIII, 88-89, and debates, 2597-2604, and 3120-3125; Schovelin *Fra kongegunst til selvstyre*, 580-581.

¹⁴⁸ The difficulties of rapid travel were vividly demonstrated to Denmark by Orla Lehmann's diplomatic journey to Berlin upon the outbreak of the Schleswig-Holstein revolt. It was urgently necessary that he arrive early enough to forestall Prussia's support of the duchies. He left Copenhagen about one o'clock on the morning of March 27, travelled by wagon and small boats to Nysted on Falster, boarded a small vessel which carried him to the Prussian coast, near Warnemünde, and climbed up the sand-bank from the shore on the morning of the 28th. There he prevailed upon a German peasant to drive him to Rostock, where he boarded the railway for Berlin, and arrived at his destination on the morning of the 29th, having spent more than fifty hours on a journey which today consumes less than twelve. Lehmann, *Efterladte skr.*, II, 107.

¹⁴⁹ *Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-54, II, 942.

¹⁵⁰ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 611-624; Hoffstad, *op. cit.*, 52; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 106-112; Vogt, *op. cit.*, 356-358.

For a brief, but authentic history of the development of the railway issue in Norway after 1845, and debates on the appropriation by the *storting* of 1851, *cf. Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-54, III, 512-537. Ueland and his friends held that the state ought to supply only one half the capital, not any right-of-way, and that to avoid the onus often attaching to public works the government ought to appoint one-half of the board of directors of a corporation. He also regretted the sectional favoritism inherent in the railway, but admitted that something must be done.

¹⁵¹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 363ff.; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 181-182; Rydfors, A., in *Statens järnvägar* 1856-1906 (Stockholm, 1906), I, 1-49.

¹⁵² Gripenstedt, *op. cit.*, I, 153; also in *Ridderskapets och adelns protoköl*, 1853-54, I, 387-388.

¹⁵³ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 615-617; *Stortings-efterr.*, 1836-54, III, 523.

¹⁵⁴ Rydfors, in *Statens järnvägar*, I, 51.

¹⁵⁵ For the documents relating to the railway question at the Swedish *riksdag* of 1853-54, *cf. Bihang till riksståndens protoköl*, 1853-54, IV, part 1, nos. 273 and 274.

¹⁵⁶ For documents relating to the Ericsson plan of main lines, state constructed, *cf. ibid.*, 1856-58, IV, part 1, no. 62; Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, 363-368; Rydfors, in *Statens järnvägar*, 49-50, and 60-81.

¹⁵⁷ *Departementstidenden*, XIV (1861), 352-356; text of railway law of March 10, 1861, specifying how the network of Danish railways should run, and under what conditions concessions to build them might be given. In 1846 the Viborg Estates, representing Jutland, requested a north to south railway through the middle of the peninsula; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 480-482; *Viborg stænder-tidende*, 1846, *betänkning* XXXVIII.

¹⁵⁸ Motzfeldt, Peter, *Breve og optegnelser* (Copenhagen, 1888), 93; *cf.*, also, Vogt, *op. cit.*, 329-333.

¹⁵⁹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 380-384; Kailhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 118-125; Kungl. telegrafstyrelsen, *Svenska Telegrafverket*, 1853-1903, *minneskrift* . . . (Stockholm, 1903), 10-31.

¹⁶⁰ Silfverstolpe, *op. cit.*, III, 181.

¹⁶¹ The urban population at the beginning of the nineteenth century and in 1860 constituted the following percentages of the total populations:

	Sweden	Norway	Denmark
1800	9.77	10.59 (1801)	21.14 (1801)
1860	11.26	14.24	23.44

Statistisk årsbok för Sverige, 1930 (Stockholm, 1931), 4; *Statistisk årsbok för kongeriket Norge*, 1930 (Oslo, 1931), 4; *Befolkningsforholdene i Danmark i det nittende aarhundrede* (Copenhagen, 1904), 14. Copenhagen accounted for a good half of the Danish urban population.

¹⁶² Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 325-328.

¹⁶³ This was cited by the founders of the Gothenburg Private Bank, in their application for a charter in 1846, as a justification for the establishment of such an institution. *Cf.* the text of the application in Brisman, *Göteborgs bank*, 200.

¹⁶⁴ From Mr. Price's journal, in Forester, *op. cit.*, 174.

¹⁶⁵ Geelmuyden, B., "Throndhjemske erindringer fra tredveaarene," in *Hist. tidskr.* (N.), 3 R., III (1895), 291.

¹⁶⁶ Renholm, *op. cit.*, 166-168.

¹⁶⁷ Forsell, *Resa till England*, 27. Hull then, 1834, had between 50,000 and 60,000 people, whereas Stockholm had about half as many more.

¹⁶⁸ Christensen, *Köbenhavn*, 1840-1857, 27; Wolff, Kaptejn A., "Livet i Köbenhavn i Frederik den sjettes dage," in *Historiske meddelelser om Köbenhavn*, 1 R., I (1907-09), 542.

¹⁶⁹ Bayard Taylor was amazed to witness the preparation for the annual market at Rånbyn in Swedish Norrland, within the arctic circle in December, 1857. " . . . Einem Jahrmakrt unter freiem Himmel unter 65 nördlicher Breite, wo das quicksilber gefriert!" *Op. cit.*, 48. For a good description of a Swedish market, *Hemiksmässan* at Örebro, *cf.*, Renholm, *op. cit.*, 250-254; and for the annual winter market at Oslo, Buch, *op. cit.*, 63-66. There were twenty-six such annual markets in Norway in 1848; Tvethe, *op. cit.*, 158-162.

¹⁷⁰ Malthus, *op. cit.*, I, 371.

¹⁷¹ Geelmuyden, "Throndhjemske erindringer," *loc. cit.*, 292-293; *Norges Land og Folk*, III (Kristiania, 2), 385-386. Except for the butchering, Malla Montgomery and the other girls in the fashionable Rudbeck household were raised on tea and embroidery; Silfverstolpe, *op. cit.*, I, 140. But in 1815, Berlin was no farther along, Clapham, *op. cit.*, 118.

¹⁷² The value of such exports increased from an annual average of 18,137 *rdr. rmt.* in the period 1840-44 to 186,465 *rdr. rmt.* to 1,249,900 *rdr. rmt.*; [Finanskommissionen], *Underdånnigt betänkande*, 58.

¹⁷³ It has been estimated that 60% of the Norwegian timber was taken by France in the early 'thirties, and only 35% by Great Britain. Friis, Jacob, in *Kristiania og skibsfarten* (Oslo, 1917), 32.

¹⁷⁴ *Amtmændenes jemaarsberetninger*, 1846-50, summary, XX; Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 192; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 471; *Stortings-forh.* 1845, *propositioner* no. 6, 26-27; Thomée, Gustaf, *Konungariket Sveriges statistik i sammandrag* (Stockholm, 1861), 162.

¹⁷⁵ This trade had until then been almost wholly in the hands of Americans, who seem to have begun it about the year 1802. *Illustreret nyhedsblad* (Oslo), I (January 31, 1852), 73.

¹⁷⁶ Laing, *A tour in Sweden*, 14; Lehmann, *Efterladte skr.*, I, 209.

¹⁷⁷ *Ny collegialtidende*, IV (1844), 433-457, carries an historical sketch and the text of the decree of March 29, 1844.

¹⁷⁸ *Departementstidenden*, VII (1854), 121-122. Text of the law.

¹⁷⁹ The revival of Danish commerce in this period has been ably described by Schovelin in various works: *Fra Kongegunst til selvstyre, passim*; *Den danske handels*

renaissance, 2 vols., *passim*; and *Privatbanken*, *passim*. Cf., also, Bergsöe, *op. cit.*, II, 497-504; Drachman, *op. cit.*, 15-16; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 474-476; Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, IV, 301-303.

¹⁸⁰ Mügge, *op. cit.*, 354.

¹⁸¹ Drachman, *op. cit.*, 16; Schovelin, *Den danske handels renaissance*, II, 456-457; Sundbæg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 161.

CHAPTER VIII

¹ Arne Garborg, quoted by Thesen, Rolv, *Arne Garborg: fra jærbu til europear* (Oslo, 1933), 32-33.

² The effort of Koch, *op. cit.*, 176-177, to ascribe their humanitarianism to pietism is unconvincing.

³ The literature on this series of reforms is very extensive, but the following are some of the better treatments: Falbe-Hansen, *Stavnsbaands-losningen*, part 1; Fridericia, J. A., ed., *Aktstykker til oplysning om stavnsbaandets historie* (Copenhagen 1888); Fridericia, J. A., *Den danske bondes undertrykkelse og frigjørelse i det 18. aarh.* (Copenhagen, 1888); Holm, Edvard, *Kampen om landboreformerne i Danmark i slutningen af 18. aarh. (1773-91)* (Copenhagen, 1888); Lund, H. V., *op. cit.*; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 314-342; Steenstrup, *op. cit.*

⁴ Kristensen, *Landbrugsstyrelsen*, 6-19; Maar, *op. cit.*, 99-101; Nathanson, *Udførligere oplysninger*, 128; Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 327. The following table (Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 342), indicates, in *kroner*, how the average price of one *tönde hartkorn* (1.36 acres) increased by five-year periods:

1751-1760	245	1786-1790	425
1761-1770	267	1791-1795	415
1771-1780	301	1796-1800	715
1781-1785	370	1801-1806	975

⁵ Feldborg, Anders Andersen, *Denmark delineated; or, sketches of the present state of that country* (Edinburgh, 1824), 68-69. Of these Danish reforms Clapham says that "The whole series . . ., coinciding as it does with the unsystematic and ill-regulated completion of the inclosure movement in England, shows the enlightened despotism of the late eighteenth century at its best." *Op. cit.*, 41.

⁶ Cf. *post*, I, 282-6.

⁷ Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 384-386; Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 48-52; Schütz, E. J., *Om skifte af jord i Sverige* (Stockholm, 1890), 115, and *passim*; Sundbæg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 132-133, and 667-671; Thoinée, *op. cit.*, 140-141; Thulin, Gabriel, *Historisk utveckling af den svenska skifteslagstiftningen, med särskildt afseende å frågan om delningsgrund vid skifte* (Stockholm, 1911), 21-31.

In 1805 serfdom was practically abolished in Swedish Pomerania and the consolidation of strips begun, with so much success that, although the Junker class was alienated, the peasants gave Gustaf IV Adolf an adoring reception when he passed through the province after his deposition in 1809. Dalgren, Lars Ejnar, *Sverige och Pommern 1792-1806. Statskuppen 1806 och dess förhistoria* (Upsala, 1914), 100-186.

⁸ *Storings-efterr.*, 1814-1833, II, 97-103. Aall's quotation is on p. 101.

⁹ *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1830-1850, summaries; Tank, G., "Salg av statsgods efter 1814," in *Hist. tidskr.* (N.), 5 R., VI (1927), 46-87.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, *passim*; Bossé, *op. cit.*, II, 314-325.

¹¹ Hansen, III, d. lit. hist., II, 369.

¹² Cf. the almost contemporaneous account of such a transaction for one Swedish village, quoted by Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 49-50.

¹³ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 124-128; Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 65-67; Holm, *Kampen om landboreformerne*, 144-166.

¹⁴ Aall, Jacob, *Erindringer*, 385; Koht, "Bonde mot borgar," *loc. cit.*, 61-62; Kristiansen, *Samferdsel i Norge*, 127-151; *Storings-forh.*, 1814-1870, *hovedregister*, 696-709.

¹⁵ Hallendorff, in *S. H. V. D.*, XII, 185-186; Thyselius, Erik, *Karl XV och hans tid* (Stockholm, 1910), 102-103.

¹⁶ *Roskilde stændertidende*, 1835-1836, 1593-1629; *ibid.*, 1842, 442-482, 3555-

3656, 4292-4374, and resolution no. XXXVII; *Viborg stændertidende*, 1842, 275-316, 2617-2674.

¹⁷ *Stortings-eltter.*, 1836-1854, II, 812.

¹⁸ This was the view of A. S. Ørsted, the representative of the Crown, at the Roskilde Estates of 1835-1836. *Roskilde stændertidende*, 1835-1836, 1416.

¹⁹ Beigsgård, *op. cit.*, II, 346, and *passim*; Boethius, in *S. H. V. D.*, XIII, 56-58; *Departementstidenden*, III (1850), 845 (text of the law of 1850).

²⁰ Maar, *op. cit.*, 164-165. These figures are somewhat doubtful, for in the *folketing* of 1850, I. A. Hansen named several estates where it had been reported that labor servitudes had been entirely abolished, and declared that in each case the report was false. *Rigsdagstidende. Forhandlinger paa folketinget*, 1850, 1st session, III, 6725-6726.

²¹ *Ibid.*, *cf.*, the text of the complicated Danish law on tithes, January 8, 1810, in *Collegialtidende* (1810), 97 ff.; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 300-302; Save, Theofron, *Sveriges historia under den nyaste tiden från år 1809 till år 1875* (Stockholm, 1890), 185.

²² *Stortings-eltter.*, 1836-54, III, 239.

²³ *Collegialtidende*, XXI (1818), 281-289.

²⁴ Bergsgård, *op. cit.*, I, 84, and 196-200; Koht, "Bonde mot borgar," *loc. cit.*, 61; *Stortings-eltter.*, 1836-1854, I, 320-326.

²⁵ *Cf. post*, II, 542-7.

²⁶ A flood of petitions was presented to the Roskilde Estates of 1844. *Roskilde stændertidende*, 1844, 617, 1260, 1556, and *passim*.

²⁷ *Departementstidenden*, III (1850), 341-347, carries the text of the law, which is dated June 27, 1850; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 424-425; Jørgenson, in *D. R. H.*, VI, a, 462; Maar, *op. cit.*, 164.

²⁸ Söderhjelm, *op. cit.*, II, 138-180.

²⁹ Thomée, *op. cit.*, 137; Thomson, *op. cit.*, I, 327-333.

³⁰ Schweigaard, *Norges statistik*, 46.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

³² Malthus, *op. cit.*, Book II, chapters I and II, discusses the restrictive land policies of Norway and Sweden as checks upon the growth of population.

³³ *Cf. ante*, I, 63-4, and 86-8.

³⁴ Agardh, C. A., *Om de lägre folkklassernas upplysning* (Stockholm, 1838), 41.

³⁵ Wohlin, *op. cit.*, 151-223, 463-464, 479-490, and 596.

³⁶ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, 11-12, and *passim*; Engelstoft, in *D. F. H.*, VII, 103-108; Kristensen, *Landbrugskrisen*, 38 and 54; Maar, *op. cit.*, 163-4 and 241-242; *Roskilde stændertidende*, 1844, petitions on pp. 562, 617, 1147, 1201, 1260, 1428, 1485, 1556, 1729, 1874, 2122, 2143, debates on pp. 1221-1260, 2847-3079, 3369-3558, resolution no. XXX, pp. LXX-LXXIX.

³⁷ Montgomery, *Industrialismens genombrott*, 57.

³⁸ *Cf. post*, II, 543-8.

³⁹ Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 391-2, 411-414, 417-418, and 466-477; Scharling og Falbe-Hansen, *op. cit.*, II, 241-242.

⁴⁰ For an excellent description of their difficulties in Sweden, *cf. Wohlin, op. cit.*, 717-727.

⁴¹ In Denmark the average annual wage paid to an agricultural laborer was 143 *kroner* between 1819 and 1839, which then purchased 21 *tønder* (1 *tønde* equals 3,9480 bushels) of rye; in 1871 it was 340 *kroner* which would purchase 25 *tønder* of rye. Falbe-Hansen og Scharling, *op. cit.*, II, 244.

⁴² Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 17-19; Falbe-Hansen, *Stavnshaands-løsningen*, part 2, 149; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 469-471.

⁴³ Schweigaard, *Norges statistik*, 57; Skappel, *Om husmandsvæsenet i Norge*, 139-152; Sundbårg, *Emigrationsutr., betænkende*, 153-155; Wohlin, *op. cit.*, 727. On the social crisis thus produced, *cf. post*, II, 617-25.

⁴⁴ Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 364. Professor C. Olufsen, the Danish economist, tested a sample of the grain that commonly went to Norway, about 1818, and found it to contain, 38% brome grass, 32% rye badly affected with fungus, 4% corn-cockle, 2.5% peas, 2% oats, 1% barley, 1% vetch, and 17.5% sweepings—sand, chaff, and various kinds of grass seed. Kristensen, *Landbrugskrisen i Danmark*, 34.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 72-73; Schovelin, *Fra kongegunst til selvstyre*, 22, and 399-400.

⁴⁶ Montgomery points out, however, that the export consisted chiefly of oats, whereas bread cereals continued to be imported, *Industrisismens genombrott*, 29-30. Cf., also, Åmark, *op. cit.*, 185-186; [Wallmark], *op. cit.*, 180-181.

⁴⁷ For figures on the price movements in the Swedish grain trade, between 1834-1860, cf. [Finanskommittén], *Underdåigt betänkande*, 26.

Between 1840 and 1843 the grain exports of Denmark proper gained ground rapidly as compared with those of Schleswig and Holstein, both in quantity and value, but in the latter year the price of the duchies' grain was still considerably better than that of the kingdom's. Bergsöe, *op. cit.*, II, 537.

Cf., also, Nielsen, *op. cit.*, 411-428; Schovelin, *Den danske handels renaissance*, I, 175.

⁴⁸ Cf. ante, I, 77-8.

⁴⁹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, 101-105; Egerström, Fr., *Den svenska lantbruksförvaltningens utveckling intill tiden för lantbruksstyrelsens inrättande* (Stockholm, 1924), 26-80; Kiaer, Anders Theodor, *Akershus amt. 1814-1914* (Oslo, 1921), 128-130; Maar, *op. cit.*, 148-9.

The report of the Economic Society in Holbæk province (Denmark) for the year 1826 is fairly descriptive of the work done by these societies. A few awards were made, among them six to laborers for continuous and faithful service; a savings bank was founded; a number of prizes were distributed, among them a new one for the cultivation of root-crops, especially turnips, for which the society had distributed fifty pounds of seed. The funds of the society in 1826 reached the sum of 2508 rdlr., mainly contributed by the larger proprietors of the province. *Holbæk amts økonomiske selskab, 1812 til 1887* (Kallundborg, 1887), 6.

⁵⁰ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 106-109; Egerström, *op. cit.*, 56; Tandberg, G., *Det offentlige landbruksvesen i Norge indtil 1914* (Kristiania, 1914), 27-39.

⁵¹ Jacob Sverdrup's school at his farm Semb, Jarlsberg province, Norway (1825); Morup, near Sorø, Denmark (1830); Degelberg, Mariestad province, Sweden (1834); and others.

The instruction in accounting did much to introduce the system of capitalism into Scandinavian agriculture.

⁵² Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 110-111; Apperman, A., in Carlsen, *et. al.*, *Danmarks kultur*, 335-339; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 310-311; Kiaer, *Akershus amt*, 1814-1914, 149-152; Maar, *op. cit.*, 148-149; Vogt, *op. cit.*, 342-343.

⁵³ Sars, in N. H., VI, part I, 482.

⁵⁴ *Landshöfdinge-berättelser*, 1822, *Upsala län*, 8.

⁵⁵ *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1846-50, summary V. Cf., also, "Kronprins Carls rapport" (1856), *loc. cit.*, IV (1900), 422.

⁵⁶ Cf., e. g., the report of Carl Flach, governor of Elfsborg province in Sweden, in *Landshöfdinge-berättelser*, 1822, *Elfsborgs län*, 6.

⁵⁷ Cf., Agardh's "Memorial," in *Presteståndets protokoll*, 1834, I, 151.

⁵⁸ Kristensen, *Landsbrukskrisen*, 71-2; Kristiansen, *Penge, kapital og arbejde*, 322-368; Järta, Hans, *Landshöfdinge-berättelser*, 1822, *Stora Kopparbergs län*, 37; Maar, *op. cit.*, 156.

⁵⁹ *Statistisk årsbok för Sverige*, 1930, 87.

⁶⁰ Kiaer, *Akershus amt*, 149, estimated that the value of land in Akershus province, Norway, doubled between 1835 and 1850.

The average annual value of rural properties sold in the decade of the 'thirties, in Sweden, was 24,511,314 *kroner*; in that of the 'sixties it was 65,940,457 *kroner*. *Statistisk årsbok för Sverige*, 1930, 76.

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*, 186-8.

⁶² Feldberg, *op. cit.*, part 1, 96-8.

⁶³ *Op. cit.*, I, 400-401.

⁶⁴ *Landshöfdinge-berättelser*, 1822, *Stora Kopparbergs län*, 26.

⁶⁵ Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr.*, *betänkande*, 91.

⁶⁶ *Amtmændenes femaarsberetninger*, 1846-50, summary, IV-V, and 1856-60, summary, IV; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 312. Knut Hamsun, in *The growth of the soil*, has written an excellent description of pioneer life in Norway. For suggestive dis-

cussions of this colonization movement in the late eighteenth century Norway, *cf.*, Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 164; and Overland, *N. H.*, V, part 2, 1930-1932.

⁶⁷ *Emigrationsutr.*, *betänkhande*, 107.

⁶⁸ In addition to the references cited above, *cf.* Juhlin-Dannfelt, *op. cit.*, 386-388; Overland, *N. H.*, V, part 2, 1947; Wohlin, *op. cit.*, 633-638, and *passim*.

⁶⁹ Keillhaug, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 127. An excellent literary picture of the manner in which the agronomists were instrumental in transforming their communities is presented in Björnsteine Björnson's story, *En glad gut*.

⁷⁰ *Cf.*, e. g., the Norwegian *Illustreret nyhedsblad*, I (October, 1851-December, 1852), *passim*, where several of the exhibits at the London World's Fair of 1851 are described.

⁷¹ Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 65.

⁷² Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 254; Bjørnsgaard, *op. cit.*, 1-5; Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 15; Heckscher, *färnvägarne betydelse*, 118; Juhlin-Dannfelt, H., *Lantbrukets i Norden, 1875-1925* (Göteborg, 1926), 49-50; Kiaer, *Akershus amt*, 1814-1914, 133-5; Kristensen, *Landbrugskruen*, 74; Laing, *Observations*, 306-307.

⁷³ Larsen, *Det danske landbrugs historie*, 130.

⁷⁴ [Finanskommittén], *Underdänigt betänkhande*, 22.

⁷⁵ Hellstenius, J., "Skördarna i Sverige och deras verkningar," *loc. cit.*, V (1871), 106-107.

⁷⁶ *Amtmændenes femårsberetninger*, 1840-45, summary, III.

⁷⁷ Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 326; Drachmann, *op. cit.*, 87-88.

⁷⁸ Bergenstråle, C. G., in *K. b.'s femårsberetninger*, 1843-47, *Jönköpings län*, 6. *Cf.* also, *Amtmændenes femårsberetninger*, 1846-50, summary, IV; Nathanson, *Udførligere oplysninger* . . ., 125-6; Odhner, *op. cit.*, III, 310-311; Schweigaard *op. cit.*, 64; [Wallmarck] *Historisk-statistisk återblick*, 180-181; Örnsköld, *op. cit.*, 34-40.

⁷⁹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 49-56, 111-112; Åkerblom, *op. cit.*, 159-175; Benterud, S. J., Grude, J., og Wold, E. E., *Meierdriften i Norge indtil 1905* (Oslo, 1908), 46-51; Bosse, *op. cit.*, II, 384-399; Brace, *op. cit.*, 337-340, has an interesting description of a model Swedish farm; [Finanskomm.] *Underdänigt betänkhande*, 16; Tvethe, *Norges statistik*, 51 [Wallmarck], *Historisk-statistisk återblick*, 181-182.

⁸⁰ Benterud, *et. al.*, *op. cit.*, 1-44; Böggild, B., in Madsen, Joh., ed., *Det danske landbrug* (Copenhagen, 1906), III, 209-210; Christensen, *Agrarhistoriske studier*, II, 97-107; Juhlin-Dannfelt, *Lantbrukets historie*, 415; Larsen, *Det danske landbrugs historie*, 132; Posse, F., in *K. b.'s femårsberetninger*, 1843-47, *Malmöhus län*, 8; Florace Marryat describes a splendid dairy on a Danish estate in 1859 in *A residence in Jutland, the Danish Isles and Copenhagen* (London, 1860), I, 420-421.

⁸¹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 64.

⁸² Nathanson, *Danmarks handel, skibsfart, etc.*, I, 385-386.

⁸³ Järta, Hans, in *K. b.'s femårsberetninger*, 1822, *Stora Kopparbergs län*, 43; Kiaer, *Akerhus amt*, 121-123, 155-156; Llewellyn, Loyd, an English sportsman who spent much time in Sweden, has a description of the peasant home industries pursued by his host, Sven Larsson, about 1828, in *Field Sports of the North of Europe* (London, 1830), I, 50-51.

CHAPTER IX

¹ *Cf. ante*, I, 139-43.

² Leverin, Carl von Linné, 106-111; Malmeström, Elis, "Linnés religiösa åskådning," in *Svenska Linné-sällskapets årsskr.*, V (1922), 1-12.

³ Tessin och Tessiniana, 303.

⁴ Koch, *op. cit.*, 183-188; Lagus, *op. cit.*, 188-218; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, X, 118-120; Wrangell, *op. cit.*, 122-124.

⁵ Bull, *op. cit.*, II, 409; Müller, in *D. F. H.*, V, 348; Starcke, C. N., *Frimureriet* (Copenhagen, 1911), 180-193; Sylvan, in Sylvan, ed., *Sv. litt. hist.*, I, 415.

⁶ Treschow, Niels, *Om gud, idee- og sandseverdenen samt de første aabenbarelse i den sidste. Et filosofisk testament, tilligemed forfatterens levnet som fortalt* (Oslo, 1831-1832, 3 vols.), I, p. XXIV.

⁷ Cf. *ante*, I, 27 and 129.

⁸ *Tessin och Tessiniana*, 369.

⁹ Lamm, *Upplysningstidens romantik*, I, 101-136, and II, 41-63.

¹⁰ For a discussion of these symptoms, cf. *ante*, 139.

¹¹ Björnson, Bjornstjerne, *Synnöve Solbakken*.

¹² Cf. *ante*, 276-302.

¹³ Levertin, *op. cit.*, I-2; Lloyd, *op. cit.*, I, 474-475; *Norges land og folk*, VII (*Jurilsberg og Larviks amt*, 2), 246-251; *Ibid.*, V (*Kristians amt*, 2), 388-393; Uhrskov, Anders, *Sagn og tro* (Copenhagen, 1923), *passim*; Visteid, *op. cit.*, 146; Wennerberg, G., "Kronobergs län," in *K. b.'s femårsberättelser*, 1871-1875, 6.

¹⁴ Max Weber and R. K. Tawney have demonstrated how Protestant ethics promoted the growth of European capitalism. But it was undoubtedly the economic revolution which gave religion its new character, rather than the reverse, although it is undeniable that the new ethics served in turn to strengthen the development of capitalism. This was true also of the Scandinavian religious revival in the nineteenth century.

Cf. Tawney, R. K., *Religion und the rise of capitalism* (London, 1916); Weber, Max, *Gesammelte aufätze zur religionssoziologie* (Tübingen, 1920-21), 3 vols.

¹⁵ Cf. *ante*, I, 282-6.

¹⁶ Cf. *post*, II, 591-8.

¹⁷ Bjornstjerne Björnson describes it superbly in *En glad gut* (*Samlede verker*, 1), 435-444. On the introduction of confirmation, cf. *post*, II, 592-3.

The confirmation ceremony was far more than a religious service; it played the same role as the initiation ceremony in primitive culture, marking the beginning of adult life. Only thereafter was it seemly for the boy to become a suitor or the girl to receive suitors, and upon confirmation it was expected that young people begin to plan their own futures. There was thus a fundamental correspondence between folk-feelings and beliefs and the religious revival.

¹⁸ Grellet, Stephen, *Memoirs of the life and gospel labours of Stephen Grellet*. Edited by Benjamin Seebohm (Philadelphia, 1860, 2 vols.), I, 361 ff.

¹⁹ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 393; Bergsöe, *op. cit.*, III, 330-332; Cornelius, *Handbok i svenska kyrkans historia* (Upsala, 1867), 296-297; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 390-396; Jørgensen, in *D. R. H.*, VI, 91; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 248-250; Rodhe, Edv., "De svenska bibelsällskapens uppkomst," in *Kyrkohistoriskt årsskr.*, VII (1906), 135-170, IX (1908), 12-64; Thrapp, *op. cit.*, II, 320; on the work of the Gothenburg Bible Society, cf. Fehrman, D., *Carl Frederik of Wingård såsom biskop öfver Göteborgs stift. I. Wingårds verksamhet för kyrka och skola* (*Lunds universitets årsskrift*, n. f., afd. 1, bd. 3 nr. 5) (Lund, 1908), 124-129.

²⁰ Cf. the letter of Wingård to Tegnér, in Fehrman, *op. cit.*, I, 125.

²¹ Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 321-325. Quotation on p. 325.

²² Bang, A. Chr., *Hans Nielsen Hauge og hans samtid* (Oslo, 3d. ed., 1910), 316-325; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 323-324.

²³ Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 419-424; Jensen, in *D. F. H.*, VI, 379-381; Ottosen, K., *Vor folkeskoles oprindelse og udvikling* (Aarhus, 1901), 120-127.

²⁴ Cf. *post*, II, 591-3.

²⁵ Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 424-443, and 575-586. On Grundtvig, cf. *post*, I, 332-8.

²⁶ Christensen, *Köbenhavn*, 1840-1857, 322, and 310-311; Clausen, *Optegnelser*, 292-295; Cresswell, Mrs. Frances, *A memoir of Elizabeth Fry: by her daughter* . . . (London, 1883), 280-285; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 652-660; Jørgensen, in *D. R. H.*, VI, 270.

²⁷ Bishop Bang, Hauge's biographer, popularized this viewpoint, *op. cit.*, 533-545. and V. Ullman accepts it in his sketch, "Hans Nielsen Hauge," in *Nordmaend i det 19. aarhundrede*, I, 1-5.

²⁸ Review of his lecture, July 27, 1933, to the conference of Scandinavian clergy in Trondhjem, in *Decorah Posten*, August 15, 1933.

²⁹ Bang, *op. cit.*, 231-258, 264-265, 364-366; Heggteit, H. G., *Den norske kirke i det nittende aarhundrede* (Oslo, 1905-1920), II, 820-826; Ousland, Gunnar, *Fagorganisasjonen i Norge* (Oslo, 1927), I, 30; Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 265-268; Ullmann, "Hans Nielsen Hauge," *loc. cit.*, I, 20-22.

- ⁸⁰ Steen, in *N. F. L. H.*, VII, 270-273; Tharp, D., "Hans Hauges fængsling," in *Hist. tidskr.* (N.), 3 R., III, (1895), 147-167.
- ⁸¹ Bang, *op. cit.*, 445-450; Heggteit, *op. cit.*, II, part I, 1-386; Keilhau, in *N. F. L. H.*, IX, 251-252; *Norges land og folk*, V, (*Kristians Amt*, 2), 331-332.
- ⁸² Gjellet, *op. cit.*, I, 360-369. On their emigration, cf. *post*, II, 653.
- ⁸³ Heggteit, *op. cit.*, II, part 2, 936-937.
- ⁸⁴ Cf. *ante*, I, 220.
- ⁸⁵ Koht, *Norsk bondereising*, 338.
- ⁸⁶ Bang, *op. cit.*, 450 ff.
- ⁸⁷ Gjellet, *op. cit.*, I, 370.
- ⁸⁸ Alstermark, Bior, *De religiöst-svåmiska rörelserna i Norrland 1750-1800* (I published in Strangnas, 1898, II, in Gothenburg, 1900), *passim*; Hasselberg, Carl J. E., *Norrlandskt fromhetsliv på sjuttonhundratalet* (Örnsköldsvik, 1919), 42-46, and *passim*; Klefbeck, Alarik, *Euska ideer i svensk frikyrklig väckelse-religiositet* (Stockholm, 1828), 3; Lamm, *Upplysningstidens romantik*, II, 59-63; cf., Bishop C. F. af Wingård's masterly appraisal of the "old readers," in his letter to von Hartmansdorff, August 28, 1831, in Fehrman, *op. cit.*, 86-88.
- ⁸⁹ Alstermark, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Hasselberg, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, IX, 326-330; Stephenson, George, *The religious aspects of Swedish immigration* (Minneapolis, 1932) 26-28.
- ⁹⁰ Quoted by Fehrman, *op. cit.*, I, 87. Cf. also Sternkrantz, Karl, *Esaias Tegnér* (Lund, 1907), 92-100, where Tegnér's dealings with the *läsare* are described.
- ⁹¹ For Scott's work in the temperance movement, cf. *post*, II, 668.
- ⁹² Cornelius, *op. cit.*, 277-278; Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 12-16 and *passim*; Westin, Gunnar, *George Scott och hans verksamhet i Sverige*, (Stockholm, 1929), *passim*.
- ⁹³ Cornelius, *op. cit.*, 289; Hallendorff, in *S. H. V. D.*, XII, 193-194; Henning, K. F. S., *Bidrag till kännedom om de religiösa rörelserna i Sverige och Finland efter 1830* (Stockholm, 1891); Sjöberg, Fr., *Utomkyrklig svensk lekmannapredikan under 1800-talet* (Stockholm, 1923); Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 42-48.
- ⁹⁴ Rodhe, Edv., *Svenska kyrkan omkring sekelskiftet* (Stockholm, 1930), 86.
- ⁹⁵ Herlenius, E., "Predikare-Lena," in *Kyrkohistoriskt årsskr.*, V, (1904), 174-184; Mortensen, Johan Martin, *Från Afsonbladet till Röda Rummet*, (Stockholm, 1913), 335-336.
- ⁹⁶ Ekströmer, C. J., *Sammandrag af de från provincialläkarna i riket till h. sundhetskollegium ingifne embetsberättelser och rapporter jemte öfversigt af utgifterne för provisialläkarnes förrättningar under åren 1838-42* (Stockholm, 1845), 15.
- ⁹⁷ Herlenius, Emil, *Erik-Janssens historia* (Jönköping, 1900); Mikkelsen, M. A., *The Bishop Hill Colony, a religious communistic settlement in Henry County, Illinois*, (*Johns Hopkins University Studies*, ser. 10, no. 1) (Baltimore, 1892); Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 49-73.
- ⁹⁸ Agardh och Ljungberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 393; Cornelius, *op. cit.*, 280; Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 74-92.
- ⁹⁹ Cf. *post*, II, 529-30.
- ¹⁰⁰ Klefbeck, *op. cit.*, 3, and 37-49; Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 39, and *passim*.
- ¹⁰¹ As early as 1856 a travelling American was convinced that the Swedish State Church was almost sure to be disrupted "in this century." Brace, *op. cit.*, 451.
- ¹⁰² On this point see especially Klefbeck, *op. cit.*, 5-37.
- ¹⁰³ Sundbärg, *Emigrationsutr., betänkande*, 136.
- ¹⁰⁴ Letter by Wingård to Kullberg, 1825, in Fehrman, *op. cit.*, I, 110.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 88.
- ¹⁰⁶ Algård, Nils, *Johan Henrik Thomander; kyrkomannen och personligheten* (Stockholm, 1924), 327-328.
- ¹⁰⁷ Cf. *ante*, I, 320.
- ¹⁰⁸ Cf. *ante*, I, 305-6.
- ¹⁰⁹ Schück, Henrik, "En konungs studieår," in *Ur gamla papper*, ser. 7, 124-131; Stavenow, in *S. H. V. D.*, X, 334-340.
- ¹¹⁰ Cf. *post*, I, 342-3.
- ¹¹¹ By far the best study of Schartau and his movement has been made by

Sodergren, Viktor, *Henric Schartau och vastsvenskt kyrkoliv* (Upsala, 1925), Stephenson, *op cit*, 35 and 38-39

⁶² Fehman, *op cit*, I, 94-98

⁶³ Algård, *op cit*, 35

⁶⁴ Fehman, *op cit*, I, 90

⁶⁵ Tegner, Elov, ed., *Brief från E Tegner till C I af Wingård* (Upsala, 1891), 52

⁶⁶ Arosenius, Sweden," in Koren, ed., *History of statistics* 550; Hillebrand, in *S II V D.*, XII, 193, Laing, *A Tour in Sweden*, 245-249, Mugge, *op cit*, 193 194, Renholm, *op cit*, 232, Stephenson, *op cit*, 1-10

⁶⁷ Such was Schartaus own marriage, although he lived purely Sodergren, *op cit*

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 183 195

⁶⁹ For an account of his disciplinary work among the clergy of the diocese of Gothenburg, which also affords a trustworthy picture of their morality, cf., Fehman, *op cit*, I, 23 64

⁷⁰ Letter to von Hutmansdoiff, quoted by Fehman, *op cit*, I, 89 90

⁷¹ Cf. *post*, II, 537 8

⁷² Grundtvig, N F S, *Udvalgte skrifter* II, 45, Helveg, *op cit*, II, 363-375

On Henrik Steffens, cf. *post*, I, 350

⁷³ Schroder, Ludvig, N F S *Grundtvigs levned* (Copenhagen, 1901), 40

⁷⁴ Begtrup, Holger, N F *Grundtvig som bibelkristen, en oversigt over hans aandelige udvikling 1811-21* (Copenhagen, 1900), 34-35, and 102 108, Grundtvig, *Udvalgte skrifter*, III, 7 51, Schroder, *Grundtvigs levned*, 36 53

⁷⁵ Grundtvig was a pan Scandinavian

⁷⁶ Quoted by Schroder, *Grundtvigs levned*, 77 Italics in the text

⁷⁷ Bergtrup, *op. cit.*, 28 29, Christiansen, Hjalmar, *Det nittende aarhundredes kulturkamp i Norge* (Oslo, 1905), 251 and 257

⁷⁸ Helveg, *op cit*, II, 506-539

⁷⁹ Quoted by Schroder, *Grundtvigs levned*, 79, cf. also Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 637

⁸⁰ Cf. *post*, I, 341-3

⁸¹ Helveg, *op cit*, II, 561-575, Jensen, Hans, *De danske stænderforsamlings historie 1830-1848* (Copenhagen, 1931-1934), II, 566 572, Jensen, in *D F II*, VI, 426-427, Schmidt, Rudolf, *Grundtvig og den tyske orthodoxi* (Copenhagen, 1883), 121, and 176, and *passim*, Schroder, *Grundtvigs levned*, 78-81

⁸² Helveg, *op cit*, II, 495-499

⁸³ Erik Gustav Geijer, the Swedish historian and statesman, arrived at much the same philosophy, minus Grundtvig's sentimentalism Cf. *post*, II, 443-4 and 456-7

⁸⁴ Helveg, *op cit*, II, 599-602

⁸⁵ Ipsen, Alfred, "Grundtvig-dyrkelsen," in *Voi fremtid*, III (1910), 341-342.

⁸⁶ Helveg, *op cit*, II, 344-347, Schroder, *Grundtvigs levned*, 39

⁸⁷ Jorgensen, in *D R. H.*, VI, 90, Knutsen, K O, "Fra en pædagogisk rejse i Danmark 1833 I-II Af K O Knutzens dagbøger," in *Voi ungdom*, 1893, 330

⁸⁸ The best study of Mynster though somewhat uncritical, is Waage, O, *J P. Mynster og de filosofiske bevægelser paa hans tid i Danmark* (Copenhagen, 1867)

⁸⁹ Treschow, Niels, *Christendommens aand eller den evangeliske lære Trimodig og upartisk beskrevet* (Oslo, 1828)

⁹⁰ Wexels, With Andr, *Tanke over og i anledning af in statsaad Treschows bog om Christendommens aand eller den evangeliske lære, udgivne i breve, som et gjennemle mod bemeldte bog* (Oslo, 1828)

⁹¹ Wexels, *op cit*, 25

⁹² Christensen, *Det nittende aarhundredes kulturkamp*, 249-250; Heggveit, *op cit*, II, part I, 386-394, cf. Skavlan, *op cit*, 123, Wergeland, Nicolai, *Tanke og bekiendelser*, (Oslo, 1818) 159-160

⁹³ Heggveit, *op cit*, II, part I, 409

⁹⁴ Algård, *op cit*, 108, Clausen, *op. cit.*, 276, Tegner, *Tal vid prestmøtet i Vexio (Saml. skr., nationalupplagan 1893, II)*, 224

⁹⁵ Algård, *op. cit.*, 11-12 29-105, 345-346, and *passim*.

⁹⁶ Clausen, *op. cit.*, 132 For this reason, Clausen viewed Kierkegaard's claim

that reason and faith are inconcilable as wholly erroneous *Ibid*, 219. On Kirkegaard, cf. *post*, I, 357-81

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 413

⁹⁸ *Katholicismens og protestantismens kirkeforfatning, lære og ritus* (Copenhagen, 1825), Martensen, H. L., *Den christelige etik* (Copenhagen, 1894)

⁹⁹ Clausen, *Optegnelser*, 107-136, and 293, Dahl, Frantz, *Fredrik VI og Anders Sandoe Orsted*, 1826, *en aktmæssig fremstilling* (Copenhagen, 1929), Helveg, *op cit*, II, 453-495, Jensen in *D I H*, VI, 381-384, Rubin, Marcus, *Fredrik VI's tid* (Copenhagen, 1895) 340-342, and 344-349, Tiels-Lund, *Bakkehus og Solbjerg næk af et nyt livssyns udvikling i Norden* (Copenhagen, 1920-1922), I, 163-187

¹⁰⁰ Clausen, *Optegnelser*, 270-271

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 218

¹⁰² *Ibid*, 171, and 216-219

¹⁰³ Algård, *op cit*, 280-307, Helveg, *op cit*, II, 660-668, and *passim*

¹⁰⁴ Clausen, *Optegnelser*, 480-481

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 464-465

¹⁰⁶ Bejrgård, *op cit*, II, 127-143, 217-223, and 379-393

CHAPTER X

¹ Geijer, *Thorild* (*Saml sk*), 1875 ed, II), 219

² *Natur und Kunst* (1802)

³ Vedel, *Studier over guldalderen i dansk digtning*, 91-105, and 167

⁴ Clausen, *Optegnelser*, 55, Fehrman, *op cit*, I, 87, Hansen, *Il d litt hist*, II, 229, Helveg, *op cit*, II, 272-275, and 278-298, Koch, *op cit*, 278-290

⁵ Gran, Gerhard, "Romantik," in *Noisk sandsliv i hundrede aar, spiedte næk* (Oslo, 1916), III, 1-26, Steffens, Henrik, *Indledning til filosofiske forelæsninger* (Harald Høffding, ed.) (Copenhagen, 1905)

⁶ Grundtvig, *Udvalgte skrifter*, II, 167-422, Høffding, Harald, *Danske filosoffer* (Copenhagen, 1909), 60

⁷ Quoted by Bøgtup, *op cit*, 60

⁸ Høffding, *Danske filosoffer*, 57-65, Orsted, Mathilde, ed, *Breve fra og til H. C. Orsted* (Copenhagen, 1870), I, 312

⁹ Waage, *op cit*, 6, and *passim*

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 21

¹¹ Cf., Andersen, Vilh., "Den heibergske skoles naturopfattelse," in his *Danske studier* (Copenhagen, 1893), 96-171, Orsted, Mathilde, *op cit*, II, 80-81.

¹² Aall, Anathon, "Filosofien i Norden," in *Edda*, V, (1916), 322-323, Rioman, Ki., "Poul Møller," in *Dansk biografisk lexicon*, XII, 95-97

¹³ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," in *Edda*, VII (1917), 102-109, and 117. How little Monrad departed from his master, Hegel, may be seen by an article, published in 1896, "Blik udi filosofiens fremtid," in *Christiania videnskabselskabs forhandlinger*, 1896, 4-12

¹⁴ Aall, *Filosofien i Norden*, 10, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc cit*, IV (1915), 223-225, Nilsson, Albert, *Thomas Thorild En studie over hans livsskildning* (Stockholm, 1915), 22-28, and *passim*, *Svensk romantik, den platoniska stromningen* (Lund, 1916), 19-75, and *passim*, Vedel, *Svensk romantik*, 128-137.

¹⁵ Geijer, Erik Gustav, *Hvilka fordelar kunna vid menniskors moraliska uppfostran dragas af deras inbillningsgätfva m. m?* (*Samlade skr*, II, 1-47), Wahlström, Lydia, *Erik Gustav Geijer* (Stockholm, 1909), 40-46, and 61

¹⁶ Cf., Book, *Essayer och kritiker*, IV, 67-78, Wahlström, *op. cit*, 60-101, 127-165, 214-248, and *passim*.

¹⁷ Geijer, Erik Gustav, *Samlade skrifter* (Stockholm, 1849-1855), I, part 1, pp. XXXII-XXXIII

¹⁸ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc cit*, IV (1915), 225-228, Høffding, Harald, "Filosofien i Sverige," in *Nordisk tidsskr*, 1879, 33-61, and 71-73, Schuck, Henrik, *Histoire de la litterature suédoise* (Paris, 1923), 223

¹⁹ Boye, *op cit*, I, 41-44, and *passim*, *Dansk biografisk lexicon*, II, 573-575

²⁰ Cf., e. g., *Kort udkast til kundskab om mennesket eller anthropologie*. Here Treschow discusses man objectively, as a part of nature, and religion, but not

Christianity in particular, as a type of human behavior. His psychology is mainly that of Locke and Spinoza.

²¹ Halvoisen, J. B., *Norsk forfatterleksikon*, 1814-1880, V, 800; Skavlan, Olaf, *Henrik Wergeland, Afhandlinger og brudstykker*. Udg. ved hans hustru (Oslo, 1892), 121; Treschow, Niels, *Om gud, idee- og sandseverdenen*, III, 164-165.

²² *Ibid.*, I (autobiography), p. XXXVI, and III, 178.

²³ Cf. *post*, I, 366 and 369.

²⁴ Treschow, *Christendommens aand, etc.*, preface, pp. V-VI.

²⁵ Cf., fn. 19.

²⁶ Höfding, *Danske filosoffer*, 90-91.

²⁷ Treschow, *Christendommens aand*; cf. *ante*, I, 339-40.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, preface, p. VII.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 55.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 79.

³² *Ibid.*, 89.

³³ *Ibid.*, preface p. VI.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 119.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 224.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, *passim*; Skavlan, *Henrik Wergeland*, 123.

³⁷ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V (1916), 196-197; Andersen, Vilh. Poul Möller: *hans liv og skrifter* (Copenhagen, 1894), 302-316, and 357-393; Kromann, "Poul Möller," in *Dansk biografisk lexicon*, XII, 95-97; Vedel, *Studier over guldalderen i dansk digtning*, 216-221.

³⁸ Andersen, *op. cit.*, IV, 122.

³⁹ Höfding, *Danske filosoffer*, 56.

⁴⁰ H. C. Ørsted to J. L. Heiberg, April 1, 1825, in Ørsted, Mathilde, *op. cit.*, II, 90.

⁴¹ Dreier, Frederik, *Aandetroen og den frie tænkning* (Copenhagen, 1852), introduction, p. V.

⁴² Ørsted, Hans Christian, *Aanden i naturen* (Copenhagen, 1850) I, 147.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, II, 38-39.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 82-83.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 36.

⁴⁶ Howitz, Franz Gothard, "Om afsindighed og tilregnelser," in *Juridisk tidskrift*, VIII (1824), part 1, pp. I-VIII, and 1-117.

⁴⁷ *Determinismen eller Hume imod Kant* (Copenhagen, 1824), *passim*.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Introduction, p. V.

⁴⁹ *Ultimatum angaaende determinismen af statraad Ørsteds fortsatte bemærkninger om samme* (Copenhagen, 1825), 26-27, and *passim*.

⁵⁰ Ørsted, Mathilde, *op. cit.*, II, 91.

⁵¹ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V, (1916), 195-196; Höfding, *Danske filosoffer*, 86-88.

⁵² Schweigaard, *Ungdomsarbeider*, 243.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 251.

⁵⁴ Lily Heber shows that Welhaven and the rest of the "party of intelligence" in Norway also considered life too complex to be confined within dogmas and philosophical systems. Influenced by Schweigaard, they too paid at least lip-service to realism. *Norsk realisme i 1830 og 40 aarene. Et bidrag til intelligenspartiets historie* (Oslo, 1914), 25.

⁵⁵ Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, VII (1917), 113-116; Christensen, *Det nittende aarhundredes kulturramp*, 67-68, and 70-83; Heber, Lily "Dansk og norsk æstetik fra 1830-aarene i europæisk belysning," in *Edda*, VIII (1917), 295 and 320; *Norsk realisme i 1830 og 40 aarene, passim*; Hertzberg, Ebbe, "Anton Martin Schweigaard," in *Nordmænd i det nittende aarhundrede* (Gerhard Gran, ed.), I, 324-328; Hertzberg, *Professor Schweigaard i hans offentlige virksomhed 1832-1870*, 10-30; Löchen, Arne, "A. M. Schweigaards filosofi," in *Edda*, XII (1919-1920), 1-36. For a keen but by no means sympathetic evaluation of Schweigaard, cf., Vinje, *Skrifter i samling*, III, 1-76.

⁵⁶ Treschow, *Om gud, idee- og sandseverdenen*, III, 169.

- 57 Cf. *ante*, I, 144.
- 58 Höföding, *Danske filosoffer*, 32-33.
- 59 *Op. cit.*, II, 89-111.
- 60 Steffens, *op. cit.*, 42-60.
- 61 *Elementer til filosofiens historie* (Copenhagen, 1811), 69-119; "Gives der noget begreb eller nogen idee om enslige ting? Besvaret med hensyn til menneskeværld og menneskevel," in *Det Konglige Danske Videnskabernes-Selskabs skrifter*, V (1807-1808), part I (1807), 238-239, and 251-252; *Om gud, idee- og sandseverdenen*, II, 332-378.
- 62 Frunck, Gudmund, ed., *Bref rorande nya skolans historia, med anmärkningur utgifna...* (*Skrifter utgifna af Svenska litteratursällskapet*) (Upsala, 1886), 49.
- 63 Olufsen, Chr., "Om menneskets rolle i den fysiske verden," in *Det Skandinaviske Litteraturselskabs skrifter*, XVIII (1822), 13-14.
- 64 *Determinismen, etc.*, 57.
- 65 *Aanden i naturen*, 145-146.
- 66 *Aandetroen og den frie tænkning*, Introduction, p. V.
- 67 *Budstikken* (February-March, 1861), 76-77. The whole review covers pp. 65-77. Italics in the text. Cf., also, Schück, *Histoire de la littérature suédoise*, 224.
- 68 Steffens, *op. cit.*, lecture IV; Treschow, *Elementer til filosofiens historie*, 97-98; *Om gud, idee- og sandseverdenen*, 373-374.
- 69 Höföding, *Danske filosoffer*, 55.
- 70 Olufsen, "Om menneskets rolle i den fysiske verden," *loc. cit.*, 4; Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V (1916), 187.
- 71 *Op. cit.*, II, 89-93.
- 72 Troels-Lund, *Bakkehus og Solbjerg*, I, 211.
- 73 *Op. cit.*, 61-62, and *pussim*.
- 74 Treschow, "Gives der noget begreb eller nogen idee om enslige ting?" etc., *loc. cit.*; Höföding, *Danske filosoffer*, 91.
- 75 Treschow, "Gives der noget begreb eller nogen idee om enslige ting?" etc., *loc. cit.*, 251-252.
- 76 Örtsted, Anders Sandöe, "Over grændserne mellem theorie og praxis i sædelæren," in *Eunomia*, I (1815), 94-145.
- 77 *Ibid.*, 99.
- 78 *Ibid.*, 136.
- 79 *Op. cit.*, II, 106.
- 80 Geijer, *Feodalism och republikanism* (1818) (*Saml. skr.*, 1875 ed., II, 269-299); Hagerup, Francis, "Nogle ord om den nyere retsvidenskabs karakter," in *Tidsskrift for retsvidenskab*, (Oslo), I (1888), 1-58; Hertzberg, "A. M. Schweigaard," in *Nordmænd i det nittende aarhundrede*, I, 324-328; *Professor Schweigaard i hans offentlige virksomhed*, 23-30; Vogt, Nils, "Frederik Stang," in *Nordmænd i det nittende aarhundrede*, I, 423-453; Wahlström, *op. cit.*
- 81 Kringen, Olav, *De første socialdemokrater i Norge* (Oslo, 1910), 123-124.
- 82 Cf. *post*, II, 628-9.
- 83 Cf. *post*, II, 626-7.
- 84 Sibbern, F. C., *Meddelelser af indholdet af et skrift fra aaret 2135* (Copenhagen, 1858-1862, I, 38-58).
- 85 An understanding of the importance of this development in German thought to the rising generation of that country can hardly be gotten better than by reading Gustav Meyer's splendid biography of Friedrich Engels, *Friedrich Engels* (Hague, 1934), I, 18-118.
- 86 Cornelius, *op. cit.*, 282; Geijer, *Saml. skr.* (1875 ed.), VII, 490.
- 87 Bööök, Frederik, *Sveriges moderna litteratur* (Stockholm, 1921), 13-14; also in *S. H. V. D.*, XIII, 335-337; Nilsson, *Svensk romantik*, 467-538; Sylwan, in Bööök och Sylwan, *Sv. lit. hist.*, II, 388-389.
- 88 Bergsöe, *op. cit.*, I, 519.
- 89 Cf. *ante*, I, 229-302.
- 90 Text of the letter in Troels-Lund, *Bakkehus og Solbjerg*, III, 84.
- 91 Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V (1916), 309-310; Allen, E. L., *Kierkegaard: his life and work* (London, 1935); Andersen, V., *Poul Möller*, 394-399; Brandes, *Sören Kierkegaard* (*Saml. skr.* I) 253-296; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 678-681;

Hoffding, Harald, *Søren Kierkegaard som filosof* (Copenhagen, 2nd ed., 1919), 28-55, and *passim*.

⁹² Kierkegaard, Søren, *Enten — Eller*, in *Samlede værker* (Ed. by A. B. Drachmann, J. L. Heiberg, and H. O. Lange) (Copenhagen, 2nd edition, 1925), II, 279; Hoffding, *Søren Kierkegaard*, etc.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 282.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 277; Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V (1916), 316-317.

⁹⁵ Kierkegaard, *Afsluttende uvidenskabelige efterskrift til de filosofiske smuler . . . af Johannes Climacus*, in *Samlede værker*, VII, 21-25, quotation on p. 25.

⁹⁶ *Enten — Eller*, in *Samlede værker*, I, 12.

⁹⁷ Hoffding, *Søren Kierkegaard*, 68-69.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁹⁹ *Hvad Christus dommer om officiel christendom*, in *Samlede værker*, XIV, 141-142.

¹⁰⁰ *Stridspunkt med biskop Martensen*, in *Samlede værker*, XIV, 27-28; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 719-761; Troels-Lund, *Bakkehus og Solbjerg*, III, 91-92.

¹⁰¹ *Samlede værker*, XIV, 85-86.

¹⁰² *Hvad Christus dommer om officiel cristendom*, in *Samlede værker*, XIV,

141.

¹⁰³ *Afsluttende uvidenskabelig efterskrift*, in *Samlede værker*, VII, 26-38.

¹⁰⁴ Heggveit, *op. cit.*, II, part 2, 928; Helveg, *op. cit.*, II, 766-768.

¹⁰⁵ Andersen, *Tider og typer*, IV, 108.

¹⁰⁶ Hoffding, *Danske filosoffer*, 170-171; and *Søren Kierkegaard som filosof*, 140-

141.

¹⁰⁷ Brandes, Georg, *Søren Kierkegaard in Samlede skrifter*, (Copenhagen, 1899-1905), II, 401.

¹⁰⁸ Nielsen og Grundtvig, in *Samlede skrifter*, XIII, 97.

¹⁰⁹ Koht, Halvdan, *The Life of Ibsen* (New York, 1931) 272-277.

¹¹⁰ Mortensen, *Från Aftonbladet till Röda Rummet*, 159-163.

¹¹¹ Hoffding, *Danske filosoffer*, 183.

¹¹² Dreier, *Aandetroen*, etc., 69-74. In this connection it is worth noting, that in 1856, at the seventh meeting of the Scandinavian scientists in Oslo, the Norwegian professor of medicine, Chr. Boeck, read a paper, "Hvorvidt er man istand til at bestemme den tid der udfordres for at udføre visse aandelige funktioner," in which he laid down the technical bases for an experimental psychology; Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, VII, (1917), 134.

¹¹³ *Aandetroen*, etc., introduction, p. XII.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 31-34.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 8-22.

¹¹⁶ *Cf. post*, II, 626-7.

¹¹⁷ *Aandetroen og den frie tænkning*, 76-77.

¹¹⁸ For further information on Dreier, consult: Aall, "Filosofien i Norden," *loc. cit.*, V (1916), 323-327; Brandes, *Frederik Dreier* (*Saml. skr.*, XV), 157-160; "Dreier, Frederik," in *Dansk biografisk lexicon*, IV, 329-331; Hansen, Arvid G., *Moderne kjættene. Litterære indlæg i dagens strid* (Oslo, 1919), 22-23.

